THE

# CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

No. 51. *MARCH*, 1806. [No. 51. Vol. V.

## Religious Communications.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

IN your number for September last, you inserted a very interesting account of the death of Dr. Martin Luther; which, I trust, did not escape the observation of many of your readers. I fear, however, that it may have been passed over by some, from the omission of a short introduction, which would have directed their attention to its merits. I beg leave, therefore, to recal that important paper to their minds. For this purpose, I have sent you some extracts from two discourses in the same volume from which the account of the death of Luther was taken; one of which, is an Oration pronounced at his funeral, by Melancthon; the other, a Sermon delivered on the same great occasion, by Dr. Pomeranus, Chief Pastor of the Church of Wittemburgh. The passages which I have extracted from Melancthon's Oration, though short, contain some striking traits of the great reformer's sentiments and character. The extracts from the Sermon, though principally consisting of a very singular account of the death of "Master Ambrose Bernarde," will be deemed highly curious and interesting by all those who love genuine Christian simplicity. I have only to add, that the following passages are all that are particularly valuable in the two discourses from which they are extracted.

JOHANNENSIS*.

*Extract from 'The Oracyon or Processe rehearced of Philipp Melanchton, at the Buryall of the Reverende Man, Doctour Martyne Luther, translated by* JOHAN BALE. Anno 1566'†.

'Myselfe verye oft commynge sodenlye upon hym, have founde hym in most fervent prayer, with abundaunce of teares ronnynge from hys eyes for the prosperouse estate of the unyversall Christen churche. He appoynted to hymselfe everye daye, a serten tyme of psalmes readynge, wherin he mixed hys prayers to God with contynuall syghynges and wepynges. And said commonlye, that he allowed not them whych, eyther for wordlye worke or for slouthfulnesse, supposed it ynough a lyttle to mourne in their devocyons. For none other purpose (sayth he) are fashyons of prayer prescrybed unto us, by the Lordes appoyntement, but that through readynge, our myndes myght be inflamed, and that our voyce myght so confesse outwardlye that God whych ys onlye to be called upon.

* I beg leave to correct two mistakes which occur in the account of Luther, in your number for September. The first relates to a town which is printed *Ballis*, for which read *Hallis*. In my map, I find this "Halle" is situated on the river Saale, or Saaldra, which falls into the Elbe. This river Saale is "the daungerouse flode" mentioned in the narrative of Luther's journey. The other mistake occurs near the bottom of the first column, page 518. On referring to the original, I found two words omitted in the passage alluded to: It should be read thus, 'What a cruell sprite our common *adversary is*. We nede, &c.'

† (In this date there is a mistake, LX. being put for XL.) It ought to be 1546.

'More over than thys, as dyverse and manyfolde daungerouse doubtes of publyque parels, have oft tymes chanced unto us, we have alwayes founde hym stronge and myghtye stomaked, and never cowardlye harted, nor yet terryfyed with wordlye sorowes. He evermore set hande upon the most sure anker. His trust was in the onlye helpe of God, and had allwayes to stand by him a fayth invyncyble.

'Farthermore thys specyall grace he had, to see verye farre in thynges of great wayght or daunger, and wyselye aforehande to seke out the best remedyes. Neyther was he, as manye men have supposed, negligent in consyderacyon of the publyque welthe, nor yet in knowlege wherunto men hath therin bene enclyned. But he perfyghtlye knewe what was most commodyouse therunto, and most warily perceyved and consydered the polycyes and conjectures of hys owne cytiezens: and though he were most quyck of wytt, yet trusted he not all to that, but affectuouslye read the ecclesyastyck wrytynges both olde and newe, sacred and prophane, with other hystoryes and chronycles, whose clere examples he proponed in all that was to be done.'

*Extract from 'The Christen Sermon made at the Buryall of the Honorable Doctour Martyne Luther, by Doctor Johan Pomerane, the chefe Pastoure of the Churche of Wittemberge. Anno Domini 1546. Translated by Johan Bale.'*

'Now have our dere father here obtayned that he longe had in desyre. Wherefor if he wer now agayne amonge us he wolde ernestlye rebuke our present mournynges with these wordes of Christ, Joan. 14. If ye love me, ye wolde trulye rejoice in my most profytable passage unto God my eternall father, or at the least be contented with my perpetuall felycyte and quyett. Christ hath for us overcomen the deathe, why shoulde we than anye more feare the stynge therof? Non other is the deathe of our bodyes now, than an entraunce of a lyfe contynuall through Jesus Christ our Lorde, whych was for us a most precyouse sacryfyce.

'I yet remember it wele, that I ofttymes hearde thys blessed man Doctour Luther saye, as he beheldc anye faythfull persone peaceablye depart hens in Christes belefe, The eternal God of heaven graunt me at hys tyme appoynted, so plesauntlye to pass hens into the bosome of Christ my redeemer, and that my bodye be not longe vexed with the terrours of deathe. Notwithstandynge yet Gods wyll be fulfylled in that matter.

'In thys unyversyte now of late yeares Mastre Ambrose Bernarde, a man sober, wyse, vertuouse, and soch a one as loved Christ intyrlye, chaunced (as ye knowe) certayne dayes afore he dyed, to be sicke and to keep hys bedde; yet felte he no sore grefe of hys syckenesse, but semed by and by therin transfourmed, as it had bene into another lyfe. For he spoke unto us most solacyouslye and plesauntlye, that he wolde rejoyce with us, as one neyther felynge of deathe nor yet dysease. He coulde not feare the deathe, for he felte nothynge therof. And ever as mencyon was made of Christ, from the verye hart he rejoyced and sayd, that grace, helthe, and mercye from God the everlastynge father, hath onlye chaunced to us by hys most meke sufferynges. An unspekable love had he unto Christ and alwayes called upon God the father in only sprete and veryte.

'As mencyon was made of hys dere wyfe and children, or of hys possessyons, rentes, and dettes owynge hym, he was so ignoraunt in all soch causes, as they never had bene knowne to hym. Us at all tymes he knewe as we communed of Christ, and named us by our names. He talked joyfullye, yea he both dallyed and laughed, but all was in spirytuall thynges; so that

a man not throughlye knowinge the matter, wolde have thought hym never to have bene worldlye-wyse in hys lyfe, neyther yet to have nede of hys bedde at that houre. In thys innocencye did the Lorde Jesus Christ take hym hens, most plesauntlye and swetelye, without other paynes to all our syght. So that havynge knowledge of the Christen faythe, with the intyre love of God and hope of the lattre resurreccyon, he neyther felte doloure nor deathe, neyther tasted it nor yet saw it. As Christ sayth Joan. 8. He that observeth my worde, shall never beholde deathe, but plesauntlye passe hens from deathe unto lyfe.

'And though all godlye belevers do not so peaceablye depart as did thys Ambrose, but have great paynes and suffre great anguyshes, as did on the crosse the dere sonne of God; yet when the extreme houre cometh, they trulye see lyfe and no deathe. As our swete father here did, whych so oft tymes, and so intyrly commended hys sprete into the handes of God; whych gracyouslye hath now delyvered hym from thys lyfe myserable to a lyfe most happye and sure. To him therfor be honoure and glorye worlde without ende. Amen.

'Thys helthsome and merrye hystorie of our Ambrose brought I in here for two causes. First therby sumwhat to mytygate your present dolours for the absens of our father here, whych ye have not without cause. Secundlye for that I see the seyd hystorye so conforme to the matter we have now in hande. Thys Mastre Ambrose was verye nygh of kynne to D. Martyne Luther, whych caused hym oft times to frequent hys cumpanye both in hys syckenesse and afore. And these were the last wordes that ever he spake unto hym. Mastre Doctour, I thanke yow of your gentyl vysytacyon. I hope as gentlye to vysyte yow agayne where we shall togyther commun of most joyfull causes. And now in dede they maye commun those matters in another lyfe, and holde soch heavenlye felyshypp as they never coulde do here.

'The same verye tyme that Doctour Martyne went so from hym, I am well remembred that he sayd thus unto me. This man is surelye gone, though he seme styll here. For he knoweth no maner of thynge perteynynge to the flesh nor yet to deathe. When we put hym in mynde of hys matters, he knoweth not the worlde nor yet thys life. He is merye, he joyfullye laugheth, and propoundeth unto us in hys innocent state most wonderfull mysteries. But in the ende he derydeth us. As who shuld saye, fare ye well now, I have no more to do with thys worlde. The Lorde of hys infynyte mercye (sayth he at the last) graunt me soch a gracyouse ende, that in the houre of deathe, I nothynge remembre thys worlde.

'In lyke maner at an other season, after the seyd Ambrose was buryed in the yeare of our Lorde M. D. XLII. in the monthe of Januarye, as he one daye passed by, he poynted with hys hande to hys grave, and sayd unto me, Thys man neyther felte hymselfe sycke, neyther yet reckened of deathe, yet was he never without Christes knowledge. Here lyeth he inclosed whych yet knoweth of no deathe. O Lorde Jesus Christ, I besyche thee vouchsave to take me so from thys myserable lyfe. Yea, many tymes sayd thys blessyd father here both to me and to other. Praye unto our most mercyfull father, that he shortlye take me unto hym—for here can I no more do, neyther yet am I anye longar profytable unto yow. Helpe me hens with your prayers, and prolonge not my lyfe on the earth. Herebye maye ye well perceyve, that he had no great pleasure here, but that hys full desyre was as was Saynt Paules, to be dysolved and with Christ. He sange hys consummatum longe afore he departed, commyttynge hys sowle to the handes of God.

'Manye other prognostycacyons we had, or sygnes afore hande, of hys goynge awaye from us. For all the yeare afore he sayd oft tymes unto us that he coveted to journaye another waye. And as he desyred, so came it to passe. For as the noble Earles of Mansfelde had sent for hym into hys owne natyve cytye of Iszleben, by hys ghostlye counsell to quyet their matters of controversye, as he did most gracyouslye, he deceased there clerelye from thys lyfe. The maner of thys Christen departynge ye have in writynge by dyverse men lerned and of most grounded testymonye, whych were there present, with the prayer whych he mayde afore he gave up hys lyfe, whych here to repete were superfluouse.'

## SKETCHES OF THE REFORMATION.

### NO. X.

### BISHOP LATIMER.

ALTHOUGH two of these sketches have been already occupied in unfolding the sentiments of the venerable LATIMER, on some of the most important points in theology, the subject is not yet exhausted. And so much am I impressed with the value of this prelate's testimony, that, at the risk of appearing tiresome to your readers, I will venture to lay before them a few additional extracts from the same sermons which have already furnished so many quotations.

After what appeared in my last paper, it seems scarcely necessary to state, that the doctrine of the corruption of man and his utter inability to save himself by any efforts of his own, is explicitly and unequivocally affirmed by *Latimer:* and that the means of removing this corruption, and remedying this helplessness, are represented with equal clearness to arise from the redemption of Jesus Christ, and the influence of his holy spirit*. Quitting therefore the consideration of these topics, I shall advert to another which has of late been the subject of much contention: I mean *the alleged identity of baptism and regeneration.* On this point, let us hear the opinion of *Latimer.*

"Except a man be born again from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God. He must have a regeneration. And what is this regeneration? It is not to be christened in water as these firebrands (the papists) expound it and nothing else." "We be born again, not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal;—by the word of God preached and opened." p. 71. "Some wicked persons say 'it is no matter whatsoever we do. we be baptized, we cannot be damned: for all these that be baptized, and be called Christians, shall be saved.' This is a false and wicked opinion." "Such fellows be worse than Turks." p. 129. "How cometh regeneration? By hearing and believing of the word of God." p. 186. "Baptism ascertaineth and assureth us, that like as the water washeth the body and cleanseth it, so the blood of Christ our Saviour cleanseth and washeth us from all filth and uncleanness of sin." p. 287. "Baptism *signifieth* that we must wash away the old Adam, forsake and set aside all carnal lusts, and besides put on Christ, receive him with a pure heart, and study to

* Although these are points which, after the extracts already given, seem to me not to admit of any dispute, it may nevertheless be expedient to subjoin a passage or two in confirmation of them.

"All we be contaminate from our birth with sin, and so should justly be firebrands in hell world without end." p. 275. "How great need have we had of Christ: for no doubt if we had not had him all mankind should have been damned, yea, the best of us world without end." p. 276. "Without Christ, of our own nature we can do nothing but commit sin, and are not able to make amends for the least sin that we commit." p. 231. "Nothing cleanseth from sin, neither in heaven nor earth, saving only the blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." p. 128. "The only remedy is to call upon God to strengthen thy faith and to endue thee with the Holy Ghost." p. 327.

live and go forward in all goodness, according unto his will and commandments." p. 290.

I will next advert to the views which Latimer entertained of the importance and efficacy of preaching the Gospel*. He declares it to be "the power of God to every man that doth believe," p. 71. "The first step in the ladder of heaven." p. 63. "Take away this, you take away salvation." p. 38. "It is the mighty instrument of God," p. 132, for "by hearing we must come to faith: through faith we must be justified." "Therefore we ought not to despise preaching, or little regard it; for it is God's instrument whereby he worketh faith in our hearts." p. 185. "But for all this," adds Latimer with becoming caution, "a man may not take upon him to preach God's word except he be called unto it; for if he do it, he doth not well, though he have learning and wisdom to be a preacher; yet for all that he ought not to come himself without any lawful calling. It was no doubt a good thing to keep the ark from falling, yet for all that *Oza* [Uzzah] was stricken to death because he took in hand to meddle with it without any commission." p. 242.

In the same strain of practical wisdom is the following remark on the proper method of expounding the parables: and I would recommend it to the earnest attention of those who are fond of tracing out a hidden meaning in every individual expression contained in them. "It is not requisite in a parable," he observes, "to expound every word of the same. For every parable hath a certain scope, to the which we must have a respect, and not go about to set all words together, or make a gloss for the same: for it is enough for us when we have the meaning of the principal scope; and more needeth not." p. 320.

I now proceed to make a few general remarks on the extracts which have been produced from the writings of this venerable prelate.

The first thing, on the perusal of these extracts, that is likely to arrest the attention of the intelligent reader, is the tone of moderation, (some would say the inconsistency,) with which *Latimer* discusses the points of doctrine supposed to be comprized in our 17th article. At one time he employs language which no Arminian would think it safe to adopt. At another time he expresses himself in terms to which no Calvinist could possibly subscribe. The doctrines of predestination and election he affirms, indeed, in a general way; and his reasoning occasionally proceeds on the admission of their truth†. But yet he evidently did not apprehend, that the affirmation of these doctrines involved, necessarily, the various consequences which almost all the modern asserters of predestination are disposed to regard as inseparably connected with it. Many of these, it is true, would concur with him in maintaining the universality of the redemption of Christ. I question, however, whether any would feel themselves at liberty to express their belief of this proposition, in terms so unequivocal and unreserved as those which Latimer has thought it right to use, when he says, for example, that "Christ shed as much blood for Judas, as he did for Peter‡."

I would just advert to another topic of some delicacy. The final perseverance of all regenerate and justified persons is considered, by modern theologians, as a corollary from the doctrines of predestination and election. It is undeniable, however, that Latimer's mode of viewing this intricate subject must have differed from theirs: because though he had before his eyes the 17th article, which he himself, it is also to be remembered, had assisted in framing; and though his reasoning stands at times on the admission

* It will be remembered that some pains have been taken of late to detract from the value of this divine ordinance.

† No. for January, p. 2—5.

‡ Ib. p. 2.

of the truth of the doctrines of predestination and election, he is yet so far from maintaining the *certainty* of the final perseverance of believers, that he makes no hesitation to affirm, that those who have been justified may lose their justification; and that the child of God may become a child of the wicked one*.

Another point worthy of remark is the small stress which Latimer seems to lay on those more abstruse doctrines to which I have adverted; and his evident wish to discourage his hearers from quitting the broad and safe ground of scriptural affirmation, in order to indulge that passion for systematising, and that taste for metaphysical refinement, which had probably begun to seduce them *from the simplicity that is in Christ*, and which have since embroiled the peace, and marred the prosperity of the church. Happy had it been for the interests of true religion, had the combatants on both sides learned, from our venerable martyr, "to keep them from all curious and dangerous questions of the predestination of God†;" an advice, it is to be observed, which the Bishop seems to address with no less emphasis to those who object to the doctrine, than to those who maintain it. May we of the present day profit by past experience, and set ourselves in earnest to study that lesson of moderation, which some of our forefathers unhappily overlooked, and which many among ourselves are also too much inclined to disregard.

It likewise deserves to be noticed that Latimer, in treating of predestination, uniformly reasons upwards‡, and cautiously infers the certainty of the election of individuals, not from the eternal decrees of God, but from their repentance, their faith, their holiness of heart and life, their universal obedience, their continuance in well doing. In the absence of these essential ingredients of the Christian character, Latimer would deny their right to any spiritual comfort: nay he would plainly tell such as were living in the wilful commission of any sin, or in the wilful indulgence of any unholy temper, that whatever may have been their past experience, they were now in a state of condemnation. (p. 3.)

But whatever question may fairly arise respecting the just and legitimate interpretation of Latimer's sentiments, on the doctrine of predestination; on points of far more transcendent moment, he has expressed himself with a clearness and fulness which exclude every pretence for doubt. These points are: The total apostacy of mankind from God in consequence of the fall, and the inevitable ruin which must follow this apostacy, without the intervention of divine grace: The restoration of our lost race to the favour of God solely by the sacrifice of his son, and to the divine image solely by the operation of the Holy Ghost: That sinful man is justified before God, neither in whole or in part by his own obedience to the divine law, but solely for the sake of what has been done for him by Jesus Christ, the benefits of whose redemption are applied to the soul only by a living faith: That he must undergo a spiritual regeneration through the power of the Holy Ghost and must abound in all the fruits of the spirit: And that by the utter renunciation of every sinful thought, word, and work, by the constant cultivation of every holy and heavenly affection, and by the undeviating performance of every prescribed duty, he must be prepared for the kingdom of heaven; from which one wilful sin unrepented of would infallibly exclude him. On these points Latimer strenuously insists, as lying at the root of all true religion.

And here permit me again to recommend to the notice of my clerical brethren, the particularity with which the venerable prelate attacks

* No. for January, p. 3.

† Ib. p. 3.

‡ In this view of the subject I am happy to say, that there exists no difference between Latimer and the intelligent part of modern Calvinists.

the reigning sins and follies of his day. He seems not to have feared the invidious reproach of legality; but to have rightly considered that *sin* retained in the practice, or cherished in the heart, is the real hindrance to the success of the Gospel. And let me ask them, do they really believe that sloth and self indulgence, frivolity and dissipation, covetousness and love of the world, deceit and dishonesty, pride and passion, sensuality and hard-heartedness, censoriousness and self conceit, inattention to relative duties, and disregard of God, are not as prevailing evils in congregations now, as they were in the days of Latimer? How then can they satisfy their consciences with dwelling, in their sermons, on some general truth however important, and with introducing some allusion to existing evils merely as an inference from the premises: instead of making a direct attack on those practices and dispositions, which, although they do not prevent a civil and accommodating admission of evangelical truth, yet do as effectually exclude Christ from the heart as infidelity itself.

Before I conclude, I wish to press one consideration on those divines who are in the habit of representing, as dangerous and heretical, the views of evangelical doctrine which are maintained by the Christian Observer. If they have any of that value for truth which they profess to entertain; if they have any regard to the awful responsibility attaching to those who either wilfully, or by their criminal negligence, contribute to its perversion; let them at least suspend their censures, till they shall have compared the sentiments contained in the work which they so unreservedly condemn, with those which have now been exhibited from the writings of one of the undoubted Fathers of our church. I challenge them to name a single point in which, if a difference does exist, that difference, judging according to their own estimate of Christianity, will not be in favour of the Christian Observer, and to the disadvantage of the venerable prelate.

Q.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

In your number for November last, you have inserted a paper signed D. W. in which the writer, from an alledged insufficiency in our present translation of the Bible, suggests an alteration in the reading of the first and second verses of the 4th chapter of the 1st Epistle of Peter. As a friend myself to sober and impartial enquiry, it is impossible for me to object to a laudable endeavour on the part of any individual to obviate a supposed difficulty of Scripture, or to throw light upon any passage in the sacred writings generally deemed obscure. Your Correspondent however, upon this occasion must pardon me, if after having attentively considered the subject of his criticism, I am obliged to differ with him in opinion, and feel disposed to adhere to the usual exposition of the passage in preference to that which he recommends.

The words of St. Peter, as translated in our Bible, are as follows—"Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin, that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God."

All the difficulty in this place, if indeed any real difficulty does exist, respects the subject, to whom the terms "he that hath suffered in the flesh," or as they are found in the original, ὁ παθων εν σαρκι, are to be referred; whether for instance to Christ or to the Christian. Because they are the words predicated of Jesus Christ at the opening of the verse, D. W. is of opinion that they must, unless we admit a very harsh and unnatural construction of them, be made to refer to the same person

in the subsequent member of the sentence. But this being incompatible with the rest of the passage, as it stands in our version, he proposes an alteration in the rendering of the verb παυλαι, which instead of "hath ceased," he would translate "hath made to cease;" so that the words, according to his interpretation, ought to run thus—"he that hath suffered in the flesh (i. e. Christ) hath made or caused you to cease from sin." For my part, however, I do not see any such ambiguity in the passage in question, as to authorize a deviation from the sense given to it by our translators; and as to D. W.'s proposed emendation, it diminishes in my opinion not a little from the force of the Apostle's reasoning.

St. Peter's object being to urge upon the Christian converts the necessity of a strict conformity to Christ, in respect both of patience under afflictions and freedom from sin, he has recourse to that peculiarity of expression, so common with St. Paul, by which the same phrases employed to describe the several circumstances in the external sufferings of Christ, are metaphorically applied to denote those inward and correspondent sufferings, which are to be experienced in the heart of the believer, and which are necessary to render him conformable to the image of his Saviour. The expression therefore ὁ παθων εν σαρκι, as applied to the Christian, who not only by outward persecution, but inward mortification, is made a "partaker of Christ's sufferings," is strictly analogous to those other expressions, by which he is said "*to be crucified with Christ*," "*to be dead to sin*," "*to be dead with Christ*," "*to be baptized into his death*," "*to be planted together in the likeness of his death*," and many more of the like kind. The whole 6th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans may be taken as a comment upon these words of St. Peter, particularly the 6th and 7th verses of it—"Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin: for he that is dead is freed from sin." The affections and lusts of the natural man constitute what is emphatically called the *body of sin*. As Christ therefore suffered for us in the flesh by bearing our sins in his own body on the tree, so is every Christian likewise called upon, after the example of his great pattern, to "*suffer in the flesh*;" and this he is to do, by crucifying and destroying that *body of sin*, which he by nature inherits, the effect of which is, that he dies to sin, or in other words, ceases from sin.

It has been observed, and with great truth, that there exists a striking conformity between the sentiments and precepts contained in this Epistle of St. Peter, and those of St. Paul. The passage under review, provided the ordinary exposition of it be retained, affords a proof of this resemblance. And if this be admitted, it is by no means an unfair inference to conclude, that the sense which best preserves this similitude of character between the two inspired writers, is that which in all probability the Apostle here designed. As to the forced and unnatural turn which the words are made to assume in our translation, this is not to be ascribed to any misapprehension of the passage, but to an inherent want of perspicuity in the original; a fault not uncommon with the sacred writers, particularly those, whose style is of a more sublime and elevated character, and whose pen, being under the infallible guidance of inspiration, disdained an attention to the technical rules and niceties of composition.

Hammond in his commentary does not notice any difficulty in this passage, though he has a note upon the words ὁ παθων εν σαρκι, which he expounds according to their general acceptation. Archbishop Leighton gives the same sense to them, from the application of the phrase in one part of the sentence to Christ, and in the other to the Christian, which,

as I observed before, is the sole cause of the ambiguity in this case, makes this judicious reflection:—"the nature of this conformity," i. e. between the believer and Christ, "(to shew the nearness of it) is expressed in the very same terms as in the pattern; it is not a remote resemblance, but the same thing, even *suffering in the flesh.*" To remove every doubt respecting the propriety of the meaning affixed to this passage by our translators, your readers need only refer to the exposition given of it by this truly pious and eminent divine.

The proposed alteration of D. W. being grounded solely upon the difficulty which attaches to the expression ὁ παθων εν σαρκι, as referred to the Christian; if this be obviated, the word πεπαυται will of course stand as at present translated. For the use of it in this sense there is abundant authority, as may be seen by referring to Parkhurst *in verbo.*

In concluding these remarks upon D. W.'s criticism, I must beg to assure him that they have not originated in any spirit of controversy, which the becoming diffidence with which his opinion is submitted to the public must have entirely disarmed; but they proceed from a conviction of the importance of that doctrine, which, as the passage is translated in our Bible, it is intended to convey, and for which D. W. would substitute an interpretation, ingenious perhaps, and certainly not unscriptural, but which, as I observed before, would in my judgment materially detract from the beauty, spirit, and force of the Apostle's argument.

S.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

Your Correspondent H. T. has conducted his criticism on 1 Tim. vi. 10. (No. for Jan. p. 6,) in a very edifying manner, and I wish in the like spirit to suggest a further remark on the passage. Ριζα being without the article, admits the verse to be rendered "the love of money is *a* root of all (these) evils;" and it is evident that the evils which had been specified might, and often are, produced by other passions. Only it may be observed, that since the love of money is a factitious passion, formed by associating wealth with other objects as the means of their attainment, it becomes a more general source of evil than any other desire, and consequently it may be said with truth, that "the love of money is *a root of all evils.*"

C. L.

---

*For the Christian Observer.*

CONCERNING THE PROPHECY OF THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

Much has been written, by diligent searchers of the Holy Scriptures, concerning the most awful prophetical words of our BLESSED LORD, relating to *the destruction of Jerusalem, and* his *second coming*; which important prophecy, is contained in the 24th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel;—in the 13th chapter of St. Mark's;—and in the 21st chapter of St. Luke's;—and may certainly be best understood, by considering all the three separate accounts of the tremendous words, in one comprehensive point of view.

Some persons have apprehended them to relate *only* to the destruction of Jerusalem; though, in truth, *that dread event,* (notwithstanding its being unquestionably a fulfilment of one great part of the prophecy) could hardly be considered properly as any *coming of our Lord;*—and though several other peculiar circumstances are mentioned in the prophetical words of those chapters, which cannot possibly be supposed to relate to that catastrophe, in the least degree.

And whilst other persons have understood the words of our Lord to have related to *three* great and separate events;—namely, 1st, *the destruction of Jerusalem;*—2dly, *the second coming of our Lord on earth;*—and 3dly, *the final end of the world;*—

as to be brought to pass, at three very different successive times;—yet it has been objected to such conclusion, that our Lord expressly says, (Matt. xxiv. ver. 34.) *This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled*;—and that, therefore, the words must be confined to the destruction of Jerusalem.

But there is one point of view, in which the words (to the best of my knowledge) have never yet been considered, that may perhaps throw more light upon the whole; which is, that they do not seem to have been sufficiently *closely translated*.

For whereas the words are generally taken, as they stand in our English translation, in St. Matthew's Gospel (chap. xxiv. ver. 34.) *this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled*;—and in St. Mark's, (chap. xiii, ver. 30.) *till all these things be done*;—and in St. Luke's, (chap. xxi. ver. 32.) *till all be fulfilled*;—yet it deserves well to be attended to, that *in the original Greek*, the words are, in St. Matthew's Gospel, —ἑως αν παντα ταυτα γενηται;—in St. Mark's, μεχρις ὁ παντα ταυτα γενηται;—and in St. Luke's, ἑως αν παντα γενηται;—and therefore, in every one of those passages, do in plain, fair translation, rather imply, simply, *This generation shall not pass, till all these things shall begin to come to pass*;—or *shall have begun to be accomplished*; for the word γινομαι, in its very properest meaning signifies *nascor; gignor*; and *orior*;—and does much rather imply, *to begin to be*;—or, *to begin to be produced*;—or, *to arise, and come forth*; than *to be completed*, or to be *entirely fulfilled*;—and indeed can hardly bear to have the latter meaning given to it, or to be used in that sense at all.

Translated in this cautious manner, the awful words will perhaps most readily lead us to understand, that the prophecy did in truth relate to *three* tremendous events in succession; the *first* of which, (as a sure harbinger, and as *a presage* of the others) should even be accomplished, *before that very generation should pass away*.

And, taken in that sense, their import seems to be very similar to that of the words, which are found, both at the beginning, and at the end of the Book of Revelations, chap. i. ver. 3. ὁ γαρ καιρος εγγυς—*the time is near*; and chap. xxii, ver. 10. ὁ καιρος εγγυς εστιν—*the time is at hand*;—intimating solely, that the prophecy contained in that book, was concerning a *succession* of events, the *beginning* of the accomplishment of which, was indeed *near*, and *at hand*, by the soon succeeding conquests of Trajan; (which appear to have been the fulfilment of the prophecy of the first seal);—and that the accomplishment of the rest, would follow in succeeding order; though the final close, and coming to pass of the things spoken of in the latter part of the prophecy, was very far distant indeed.

Thus, therefore, by a more close attention to *one single word*, we may perhaps be led to see more force, and energy, and a more clear consistency in the whole of our Lord's tremendous answer to the disciples' question: and may understand, that Jerusalem and the temple were indeed to be destroyed, during the continuing of that generation;—but that the second coming of him our Lord THE MESSIAH, in glory, was afterwards to be at a certain appointed time preceded by other certain signs, and accompanied by his sending forth his holy angels to gather his chosen servants:—and that the *third* event, the final destruction of the world, was not only still more remotely distant, but was reserved for a time and day known to THE FATHER only.

A PLAIN HONEST MAN.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

OBSERVING in your Number for January, p. 11, a query proposed by your correspondent C. respecting the lawfulness of anger and the

meaning of Ephesians iv. 26. I could wish it not to pass unobserved. Your correspondent produces a note of Dr. Guyse's on the verse, stating anger to be an innocent passion, and allowable on just occasions: but at the same time declares that sentiment not to coincide with his own views. As I have frequently considered the subject with attention, permit me, Sir, to give you my opinion, with the grounds on which it has been formed. I conceive then that the verse should be understood in its literal sense, and that anger, on certain occasions and with certain qualifications, is allowed in Scripture. And this conclusion I am inclined to maintain for the following reasons. Anger or wrath is perpetually ascribed to God, both in the Old and the New Testament; as also to Jesus Christ in Mark iii. 5. The prohibitions against it, unlike the prohibitions against other sins, are frequently only of a qualified nature; as, especially, that of our Saviour's, Mat. v. 22, &c. "He that is angry with his brother *without a cause*," &c.; that of St. James, i. 19. "Let every man be slow to wrath;" Titus, i. 7. "not soon angry." See also Prov. xiv. 29. xv. 18. and xvi. 32.

I am aware that some may object against the argument drawn from the passion of anger being ascribed to God, that the expressions made use of are not intended to be taken in their most literal sense, but only as marking the excessive deformity and baseness of sin, (with which alone, be it remembered, God is ever said to be angry) and as an accommodation in some degree to our views; in the same way that it is sometimes asserted that God repents him of any thing. But to those who are conversant with the Scriptures, this interpretation will not be satisfactory. Numerous passages must occur to them in which God's anger against sin is affirmed in such clear and unequivocal terms, that to have recourse to such an interpretation, will appear to be unwarrantable. Nor does it seem in the least degree at variance, but on the contrary, in perfect union with the other attributes of God, that he should entertain a holy indignation against iniquity. The day of final retribution is emphatically stiled the "day of wrath."

I have also assumed it as undoubted, that our Saviour felt a holy anger, when he perceived the hardness of heart with which the Pharisees opposed him. For ὀργὴ, the word there used, is always interpreted anger, and properly signifies an inflammation of mind with a purpose of revenge. It is often taken for punishment itself, and is far stronger than Θυμος, which is properly the antecedent perturbation of mind*.

From these premises I am disposed to conclude, that anger is allowable *on certain occasions and with certain qualifications*. But to fix these is a difficult point and requires great caution. The only case then which I think warrants the exercise of anger, is a case in which the honour of God is concerned;—such as that of Phineas, that of Moses perhaps on the Mount, that of Nehemiah (chap. v. 6.), and that of our Saviour, Mark iii. 5. The necessary qualifications in my opinion are, that the anger should be but temporary, ("Let not the sun go down upon your wrath,") and that it should be exercised against the sin and not against the person committing it, ("being grieved with *the hardness of their hearts*.") Unless we admit thus much, I am at a loss to imagine how the difficulties already stated are to be cleared up. And yet so strongly and repeatedly is anger condemned by the sacred writers, and the opposite tempers of meekness and gentleness enforced: so contrary are the graces displayed by our blessed Saviour and his apostles, to an angry and indignant spirit, that I cannot conceive that the prohibitions were directed merely against the abuse of the passion; and that the passion itself is innocent, or one implanted in the

* Vide Leigh's Critica Sacra in voces.

perfect and original frame of human nature. For it must be remembered, that had the fall never taken place, and sin never been introduced into the world, anger could have had no subject whereon to fix; every thing in that case being holy, pure, and lovely.

The only way likely to clear the difficulty which necessarily arises from the circumstance of anger being criminal, and being at the same time ascribed to God (as it repeatedly is) and to Christ, and being also frequently prohibited in Scripture only in qualifying terms, is, in my opinion, to suppose, that the case justifies its exercise; and that when we observe the honour of God insulted, his precepts contemned, or his name prophaned, the Scriptures warrant the exercise of a holy indignation and zeal against the crime. Nor is it easy to imagine that a Christian, who is much concerned for the honour of God, could in such a case feel perfectly free from emotion. This would seem to argue a degree of lukewarmness, and blameable indifference.

Here however arises the danger: for it requires no slight degree of Christian wisdom and moderation to separate the act from the agent; and to unite with a holy indignation against the one, a sincere and unfeigned love towards the other. Perhaps it was the excess of this holy zeal which occasioned the fall of Moses at the waters of Meribah. And there are few things, I am persuaded, more destructive to all the winning graces of Christianity, and few against which a Christian has more need to be always on his guard, than an intemperate zeal on the subject of religion: a zeal which, without any attention to its indispensable qualifications, pursues its object with heat and acrimony, and regards with aversion all who chance to differ from it in principle or practice. Against such zeal, Mr. Editor, I would protest with as much earnestness as any of your readers.

Difficulties, I am sensible, may be urged against the opinion here maintained, of the lawfulness of anger when the subject is sin, and especially any great and heinous sin; and examples might be produced from the New Testament to prove, that even in such cases, our Saviour and his apostles appear to have entertained no emotions of anger or indignation. For instance, it might be deduced from the premises I have laid down, that a good man, who was witness to our Saviour's sufferings, and who was convinced that the only motive of the Scribes and Pharisees in destroying him was malice and envy, would be justified in feeling a degree of indignation and anger against the horrid crime. But we certainly do not hear of any such feelings being entertained by our blessed Lord, "who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before his shearer is dumb" &c. nor by Paul and Silas when scourged and imprisoned at Philippi. There appear to me only two ways of obviating this objection, and neither of them are sufficiently satisfactory to my mind: one is to suppose that the highest degree of meekness, gentleness, and long suffering, were capable of being united in the breast of our Lord with anger and indignation at the crime, (certainly wrath was treasured up against the Jews for this crime): another, that a spectator of the crime might entertain feelings of indignation, which the sufferer himself could not lawfully indulge; and that St. Peter for instance, if a witness of our Saviour's sufferings, might have felt an anger which, were he himself the sufferer, would have been criminal.

These considerations I present to your readers with diffidence. The objection last stated, shews the necessity of forming a decision with caution and humility. I do not pretend to have laid down the right distinctions of so intricate a subject: but I was unwilling, for the weighty reasons mentioned by your correspondent C. to permit the point to pass unobserved. I should rejoice

as much as any of your readers, if one of your able and experienced correspondents would favour us with some further remarks on the subject.

Before, however, I conclude this paper, I would endeavour still further to guard against any mistake into which my partial defence of the lawfulness of anger may lead any one. I feel a much more earnest desire, Mr. Editor, through the medium of your valuable work, to promote the interests of practical religion, than of merely speculative knowledge. I beg leave therefore to state, in the most unequivocal manner, my persuasion of the *general* sinfulness of anger, harshness, and severity. Indeed the expressions of Scripture on this point are strong and frequent. It were needless to cite passages; but let the Christian who feels himself tempted to this sin, especially dwell on the meekness, and gentleness, and long suffering of his blessed Saviour under insults, and injuries, and sufferings, of the severest kind. Let him endeavour to impress on his mind the pathetic manner in which Christ, the night before his crucifixion, urges on his disciples the duty of loving one another. Let him reflect how contrary all headstrong and violent tempers are to the genius of the Gospel. Let him never forget the disgrace which they draw upon Christianity, the obstacles which they place in the way of his own usefulness, and the degree in which they break in upon the peace and comfort of all around him. Let him never be inclined to excuse or palliate them in himself under the notion that they are the failings of the best of men; and that in himself they are only the passing shade and not the settled colour of his mind. On the contrary, let him endeavour to acquire a deeper and deeper impression of their malignity and deformity, of the degree in which they now obstruct the growth of his Christian graces, and in which they will hereafter dim the lustre of his heavenly crown. And when thus convinced of their sinfulness, let him watch with the most incessant vigilance against their breaking forth into act. Let him join with this watchfulness frequent and earnest prayer to God for heavenly support. And let him be indefatigable in cultivating and encouraging all the more amiable and attractive qualities, which shone with such perfect lustre in the character of our Lord, and in a very high, though inferior, degree in those of his followers. In the unceasing use of these means he may confidently expect the divine blessing and assistance; and advancing in the same constant resolution and fervent endeavour, he will find these evil tempers continually giving way, and their place more and more supplied by a sweet serenity and holy joy.

Miraturque novas frondes et non sua poma.

Z.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

I PRESUME, Mr. Editor, that the Christian Observer is read by many young men, and by some perhaps, who, though they may have the benefit of religious parents, may be in danger of falling into various kinds of vice. Parents however, and particularly mothers, are often unwilling to suppose that their sons are in any peril of this sort, and especially at a very early period of life: and it is a maxim with many, that it is better not to appear jealous of a son's conduct in this respect. I believe however, that some youths have been ruined through the want of sufficiently timely care, in those whom Providence had constituted their guardians. Our Metropolis, in particular, abounds with temptations, which only those who are subject to them know fully how to appreciate. Not only the theatre but the whole town is full of the snares to which I allude. There may, undoubtedly, be a degree of jealousy which is excessive, and which even defeats its own purpose. Let no

parent however, cast aside anxiety, under the shallow and poor pretence that you do but "put bad things into the minds of young men," by discovering to them your concern upon the subject.

But I wish chiefly to address young men themselves, and the principal advice which I would offer is, to beware of the beginnings of sin, and to remember always, that the eye of God is upon them. When temptation of any kind arises, the difficulty of resisting it is encreased tenfold, if we can but persuade ourselves that, in yielding to it, we yield but for once, and that no human eye shall see us. Let us illustrate this observation by the case of the robber. A man ventures, as we will suppose, on the highway. In doing this, he risks an ignominious death; and the utmost profit which he can gain is small. What induces him to this step? His chief inducement is an idea that he shall transgress but once; that no fellow creature shall detect him; and that the purse which he shall take will therefore be clear gain: having obtained this one purse he will return to the paths of virtue, since he is well aware that if he should resort to robbery as his trade, he must eventually be found out. The highwayman, however, like every other sinner, soon finds that one criminal act is introductory to another; that the temptation strengthens as he proceeds; and that to the first inducement to break the law is now added the habit of violating it: and the power of habit who can conceive! Let the young man whom I am addressing apply this case.

I will offer only one additional remark.

In whatever degree we dread sin, in the same degree shall we commonly be disposed to guard against it. Many parents of a worldly character are *somewhat* apprehensive lest their children should fall into vice; but they are not *sufficiently* fearful of it. They are willing, therefore, to permit a son to expose himself to some few temptations. For example they allow him to frequent a theatre; although there are some bounds to the liberty which they grant. But that parent alone, whose mind is tremblingly alive to the dangers which surround his offspring; and that son alone whose conscience is tender, and who shrinks at the very approach of sin, will be disposed to admit the necessity of the extreme caution which I am recommending. There are some animals which approach their adversary without being observed, but which, if once permitted to advance, spring suddenly upon their prey, and there is then no possibility of escape. From such insidious enemies it is prudent to fly on perceiving even the least scent of them in the wind, or on hearing the most doubtful sound of their feet. And does not every sin advance upon us in the same manner? Are we not made captives to it while we are yet doubting whether it is so near, that it has become necessary to begin to fly? I submit this subject to the serious consideration of those whom it may principally concern; requesting them at the same time to add to their vigilance and circumspection, earnest prayer to God for the efficacious influence of his grace.

S. P.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

THE increase of Dissenters in this kingdom has been so great for some years past, that it becomes every real and zealous member of the Church of England to enquire diligently into the causes producing this increase; and to use strenuous exertions in preventing more extensive separations from our established religion. On this account I feel myself perfectly justified in examining the manner in which many pious clergymen have conducted their private religious societies. Some persons, perhaps, will be ready to conclude that we ought to condemn these altogether. But if properly conducted, I conceive that they are agreeable

to the practices of religious men in former times, and agreeable also to the laws of the Church of England. Let us attend to what is said by the pious Mr. Nelson. In the preface to his Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England, he commends the devout practices of certain religious societies; and afterwards argues thus: "I see no reason why men may not meet and consult together, to improve one another in Christian knowledge, and by mutual advice take measures how best to further their own salvation, as well as promote that of their neighbours; when the same liberty is taken for the improvement of trade, and for carrying on the pleasures and diversions of life. And if at such meetings they shall voluntarily subscribe any certain sums, to be disposed of in such charities as shall seem most proper to the majority of their members, I cannot imagine how this can deserve censure, when the liberal contributions of gentlemen to support a horse race, or a music meeting, have never been taxed with the least illegality. And as for those objections which are urged against these societies from some canons of the church, they seem to be founded upon a misunderstanding of the sense of those canons, viz. Can. 12 and 73; the first whereof, was designed against the pernicious opinions of the Anabaptists, and the latter only against such meetings and consultations, as tended to the impeaching or depraving of the doctrine of the Church of England, or of the book of Common Prayer, or any part of the government and discipline now established in the Church of England; neither of which consequences can be justly charged upon a body of men, who make it a chief qualification in the electing their members, that they be such as own and manifest themselves to be of the Church of England, and frequent the public holy exercises of the same." The societies to which Nelson here refers are those, I believe, of which Woodward has given us an account. As far as I am acquainted with the private religious societies of the present day, very few of them are in all respects similar to those referred to by Nelson, though most of them resemble them in some points, and some of them differ only in a small degree.

When I observe the traits of character which distinguish the present age, I think that in private religious societies, extemporary prayers, exhortations, and expositions of Scripture are generally, though perhaps not universally, productive of evil. The opinions and actions of men, from age to age, have continually given the clearest proof that they are strongly inclined to go to extremes. Religious professors, particularly in the lower classes of society, are disposed to a species of mysticism. Because in religion, many persons contented themselves with a body without a soul; they will not be satisfied unless they have a soul without a body. The necessity of fervour and spirituality in divine worship, is a point which cannot be soberly denied: but to suppose that the man who makes use of a form of prayer, and reads a homily or sermon, is not as earnestly or spiritually employed, and does not enjoy as much of the influences of the holy Spirit, as any other person;—to expect such divine assistance as excludes the necessity of using diligently all human helps;—and to conclude that extemporaneous prayers and sermons are dictated by the Holy Ghost in a manner which is not ordinary;—are palpable errors of no small magnitude. But religious professors have manifested some disposition to fall into these errors, and therefore it is the duty of the clergy to oppose them; to rectify the judgments of the people, and to correct their vitiated taste. And, in order to effect this, it is requisite to abstain from certain practices, which under difficult circumstances may be innocent, or even laudable and necessary. My first argument therefore, is of a general

kind; the object of which is, not only to discourage, but also effectually to oppose and eradicate a prevailing error, which has diminished in the people their esteem of the services of our church.

In the 2d place, regard ought to be had to the consequences which frequently follow the death or removal of a pious clergyman. It is a lamentable evil that a succession of pious ministers cannot generally be secured in different places. If a wicked and careless clergyman succeeds an exemplary and zealous pastor, it is not to be wondered at if many persons in the parish, unable or unwilling to estimate probable future consequences, guided by their feelings more than by their judgments, and continually assaulted by the assiduous attentions of dissenters, should leave the Church of England. This is a serious evil, against which every clergyman ought diligently to guard. Now I apprehend that private religious societies will produce directly contrary effects according to the manner in which they are conducted. If their existence and continuance depend solely on the present officiating clergyman, it is evident that his removal will occasion their dissolution. And in this case, the parishioners will find a greater want of religious instruction, than if they had never enjoyed the benefit of these societies: and this deprivation will appear to them to afford an additional cause for frequenting dissenting chapels. Now if, in such societies, the prayers and instructions which are delivered be extemporary, the whole must depend upon the clergyman of the parish, unless laymen be allowed to officiate. I am aware that there are laymen whose abilities, piety, and prudence, qualify them for such a charge; but the number of such is very small indeed. Some few pious men possess sufficient prudence, but their abilities and attainments are not equal to the undertaking: but in general, there is a much greater want of prudence than of ability. How many men have begun at first to conduct private societies, and discontented with this narrow sphere of usefulness, or perhaps, more probably, discontented with this obscure display of their abilities, have ultimately become dissenting preachers! In such a state of things we may reasonably ask, How shall a line of separation be drawn between those laymen who are qualified and those who are not? How shall a clergyman encourage some to engage in this undertaking and discourage others? Is it not much more easy to cause a man, who is really able and pious, to desist from regard to the general good, than to persuade an ignorant conceited man of his want of qualifications? Who is most ready to offer his services? The man of ability or the conceited person? The venerable veteran in the service of Jesus Christ, or the ignorant religious talker?

But let us proceed to consider the manner in which religious societies may be conducted, so as to produce the most permanent good. It is not my intention to attempt to decide whether in all cases such societies be necessary and useful: but when they are established, it is the duty of the person who conducts them to attend to several points of importance; to guard against any the least relaxation of the discipline of the Church of England; to encrease in the minds of the people a veneration and love for our public services; and to adopt a plan which the people shall be able to pursue, when their pious pastor is removed, and which shall, as far as possible, enable them to obtain spiritual food in the church, when the instructions they hear from the pulpit are not pure and scriptural, are not agreeable to the articles and homilies of our church. If this can be done, then these societies, instead of indirectly promoting separation from the church, will prove a sacred barrier fortifying our ecclesiastical establishment.

Persuaded that *some* good may be

done in this way; I will beg leave to offer you a few outlines of a general plan for a religious society. The members should all be strict churchmen, who do not attend dissenting chapels or meetings: the prayers made use of should be some well selected form: nothing extemporary should be admitted; but at each time of assembling together, a chapter or sermon should be read from some judicious publications of *our own divines*. And in order more fully to guard against every evil, I would recommend that the society should meet in the vestry of the church, according to the plan pursued by Woodward's societies. And as many pernicious consequences might arise, were the members to choose the books which are read in the society, it would be proper and highly necessary that the clergyman who establishes the society, should select, for its use, from 20 to 50 volumes of the best religious publications; and it should be appointed that these books, and these only, should be read when the members meet together. This regulation, if adhered to, would exclude heterodox opinions, and prevent any departure from the sound doctrines of our church; and would, at the same time, afford sufficient variety of instruction for all persons whose sincere object is religious improvement, and not unmeaning gratification. And if I were consulted concerning the prayers proper for such a society, I would recommend that many of them should be taken from the book of Common Prayer; and that in order to excite and keep alive a fervent earnestness in devotion, a suitable litany should be appointed: and indeed, throughout the whole form, it would be advisable that at proper intervals, between the prayers read by the president, suitable responses should be made by all the members together.

It is probable that some persons will remind me that the societies recommended by Nelson were accustomed to propose subjects, concerning which each member was at liberty to deliver his opinion; and that therefore, they do not exclude extemporary discussions. This must be allowed: but I must request the reader to consider the difference between our own times and the age in which Nelson lived. In the present day, men manifest a sad neglect of the Church of England, of its services and discipline: but a century ago, there were but few dissenters, and the church was regarded with affection and veneration: and from Nelson's Introduction it evidently appears that the members of the societies of which he speaks frequently joined in the public prayers of the church, not only on the Sundays, but also on the other days of the week. So long as such sentiments and practices prevailed, there was no fear of harm arising indirectly from the societies: but things are altogether different in the present day. Many of our duties vary considerably, and are dependent on circumstances; and what is necessary and prudent now might not be so in former times.

CHURCHMAN.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

SIR,

I SEND you a bibliographical account of three editions of a work of considerable importance, but involved in much obscurity, The Erudition of a Christian Man, published by authority in the time of Henry VIII. If your readers will contribute what further knowledge they may possess on the same subject, you may, in some future number, be able to give a tolerably complete list of the different editions of that curious and interesting production.

The editions, of which I here give a short description, are to be found, and were examined by me, in the British Museum.

The first is in 18mo. The title is as follows: "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Chrysten

Man, set furth by the Kynges Maiestye of Englande, &c.," with two verses from the xixth and xxth Psalms. The date on the title page is 1534; an evident mistake, the two last numbers being transposed. It has a preface by the King. The pages are not numbered. The work itself consists of ten articles. The colophon: " This boke bounde in paper bourdes or in claspes, not to be sold above xiiiid. Imprinted at London, in Fletestrete, by Thomas Berthelet, Printer to the Kynges Hyghnes the xxix daye of Maye, the Yere of our Lorde M. D. XLIII. ☞ Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum."

The next is in 4to. The title the same. The *leaves* only are numbered, and amount to 94. The colophon is the same exactly, excepting the price of the book, which is here " xvid."

The third is a Latin translation of the foregoing work in 4to. with the following title, " Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio. Londini apud Thomam Bertheletum. Anno M. D. XLIIII." The preface is not that of the king, but one by the translators. It is evidently a translation of the Erudition, not of the Institution published before, as the title might lead us at first to imagine. The pages are not numbered. It has the date repeated at the end. CRITO.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

IN answer to an inquiry of one of your correspondents some months ago respecting Hebrew and Italian Bibles, I observe that Foster's and Vanderhooght's Hebrew Bibles seem to come nearest to what he is in quest of; the former is in two volumes, 4to, the latter in 2 vols. 8vo. both excellently printed, correct, and not very expensive. Of Italian Bibles there are four different translations, three by Papists, and one by Diodati, which is far superior in purity of language to the former. See Simon's Critical History of the Old Testament, book ii. chap. 22 and 23; and likewise the Encyclopædia Britannica under Bibles. I have seen a later translation than these, but had not an opportunity of discerning whether it were papist or protestant. The whole Bible of Diodati sells dear, and it is difficult to procure the New Testament by itself. GINSEPPE.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

IT was with much pleasure that I observed in a late Number of your Miscellany (that for December last, p. 740,) a just tribute of commendation paid both to the purity, and to the exquisite beauty of Mr. Scott's " Lay of the last Minstrel." I regretted that the " Suthron" who did honour to his taste by recommending to the notice of your readers this elegant production of a Caledonian bard, did not fortify his recommendation by one or two extracts. He would at once have adorned your work with lines which might furnish a convenient contrast to those which have flourished their day on your blue cover; and have gratified such of your readers as have had no access to the Poem itself. He would also have given you an opportunity, of proving that you know how to distinguish and to value poetic excellence.

In undertaking to remedy the deficiency of which I have complained, I feel myself, however, under some difficulty: for such is the multiplicity of passages which court selection, either on account of the fas-

cinations of the verse, the pathos of the sentiment, or the justness and vividness of the description, that I have been at a loss where to fix. The two passages which I have at length ventured to transcribe, have been chosen on account of their bearing a nearer relation to the subjects that usually occupy your pages, than any others which would equally admit of being dissevered from the text. The first extract I shall give, represents the fatal termination of one of those single combats which, in the dark ages, were the appointed means of deciding such disputes as involved the honour of either party.

"'Tis done, 'tis done! that fatal blow
Has stretch'd him on the bloody plain:
He strives to rise—brave Musgrave, no!
Thence never shalt thou rise again.
He chokes in blood—some friendly hand
Undo the visor's barred band,
Unfix the gorget's iron clasp,
And give him room for life to gasp!
O bootless aid!—Haste, holy friar,
Haste, ere the sinner shall expire!
Of all his guilt let him be shriven,
And smooth his path from earth to heaven.

In haste the holy friar sped,
His naked foot was dyed with red,
As through the lists he ran:
Unmindful of the shouts on high
That hail'd the conqueror's victory,
He rais'd the dying man.
Loose waved his silver beard and hair,
As o'er him he kneel'd down in prayer;
And still the crucifix on high
He holds before his darkening eye;
And still he bends an anxious ear,
His faultering penitence to hear:
Still props him from the bloody sod,
Still, even when soul and body part,
Pours ghostly comfort on his heart,
And bids him trust in God.
Unheard he prays: the death-pangs o'er,
Richard of Musgrave breathes no more."

I shall add only one more passage. It is taken from the close of the Poem, and describes the funeral rites performed, after the popish manner, in honour of the unfortunate Musgrave. It thus proceeds:

"And slow up the dim aisle afar
With sable scowl and scapular,
And snow-white stoles in order due,
The holy fathers two and two
In long procession came;
Taper and host, and book they bare,
And holy banner flourish'd fair
With the REDEEMER's name.
Above the prostrate pilgrim band,
The mitréd abbot stretch'd his hand,
And bless'd them as they kneel'd:
With holy cross he sign'd them all,
And pray'd they might be sage in hall,
And fortunate in field.

Then mass was sung, and prayers were said,
And solemn requiem for the dead;
And bells toll'd out their mighty peal,
For the departed spirit's weal;
And ever in the office close
The hymn of intercession rose:
And far the echoing aisles prolong
The awful burthen of the song
DIES IRÆ, DIES ILLA
SOLVET SÆCLUM IN FAVILLA:
While the pealing organ rung;
Were it meet with sacred strain
To close my lay, so light and vain;
Thus the holy fathers sung:

*Hymn for the Dead.*

That day of wrath, that dreadful day,
When heav'n and earth shall pass away,
What power shall be the sinner's stay?
How shall he meet that dreadful day?

When shrivelling like a parched scroll,
The flaming heavens together roll;
When louder yet, and yet more dread,
Swells the high trump that wakes the dead:

O! on that day, that wrathful day,
When man to judgment wakes from clay,
Be THOU the trembling sinner's stay,
Though heav'n and earth shall pass away."

L. B.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

THE subject of duelling has of late been so fully investigated, and its sinfulness so clearly demonstrated, that one would imagine no unbiassed and considerate mind would resist the proofs which have appeared in your publication, and in many excellent dissertations on the subject. But we find by daily experience the truth of that scriptural declaration, that the depravity of human nature requires "line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little;" and this has induced me to hope, that notwithstanding the number of treatises that have

appeared on the subject, another short consideration of it might, by the grace of God, not be found unprofitable. And I was more especially desirous to address you, because I thought it might be useful to make more public a very forcible argument against duelling, which I first learned from a novel, and never saw in any other publication. In the novel to which I allude, a professed libertine has by the most disgraceful means ruined a virtuous young lady, and thus occasioned her death. In consequence her cousin challenges, and kills him; but being a man not wholly destitute of serious impressions, he afterwards breaks forth into this pathetic lamentation: "When God would have given him time to repent, I would not." I know not, Mr. Editor, that I ever saw an argument against duelling, which speaks more forcibly to a heart not utterly devoid of feeling. Would every duellist, before he enters the lists, reflect that in seeking his adversary's life, he endeavours to send him laden with unrepented sin into the presence of an avenging God; that he aims to the utmost of his power to consign him to a place of eternal torments; I think it might be a check even to some whom abstract considerations of duty fail to move. Surely human nature, even in its most depraved state, would shudder at the thought of being the cause of eternal misery to a fellow creature.

And let not the man who accepts a challenge merely to preserve his character in the world, without any feelings of malice, hatred, or anger, against an adversary, nay, who enters the lists with a full determination not to take away his life, let him not I say, imagine, that this consideration does not apply to his case. Is not self murder (I would demand of him) a breach of the sixth commandment? In the same manner as the sixth commandment applies to the case of a self murderer, does the consideration now before us apply to the case of the person who hazards his own life in a duel, even though he attempts not that of his adversary. God would give you time to repent: you refuse it; you voluntarily throw yourself upon his anger, laden with all your unrepented sins; nay, leaving the world by a sin which, in as much as it is a violation of his law, an express contempt of his command, is alone sufficient to whelm you in everlasting misery. You are the condemned criminal, who, scorning the reprieve offered by royal clemency, insists on dying by the hands of the executioner. Such an infatuated wretch you would in any other case pity or despise; yet by your actions you approve his conduct. Thus *you* treat *your* heavenly king; thus *you* refuse to receive *his* merciful offers. The sinner, who lives from day to day in his iniquity, expects, or at least hopes, that a time may come when worldly cares and worldly enjoyments will no longer oppose his receiving God's offers of mercy, and piously employing the time granted for repentance. You at once cut yourself off from every such hope; you look forward to no such future day, but willingly and purposely die in your sins. He acts as a hardened but trembling sinner; you as an infidel. You may escape from a duel with life; possibly the chances are in your favour; still, however, your guilt is the same; still you cannot deny that you court death, that you provoke damnation.

I would wish that every one, who has received a challenge, and finds it difficult to incur the disgrace attendant on refusing it, would once ask himself the following questions: If I kill my adversary, do not I deny him the time which God would grant him for repentance? If I myself am killed; do not I, as a *self murderer*, deny to myself that time for repentance which God would grant to me?

S. F. N.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

In your volume for 1804, p. 547, you have inserted an anecdote of the Slave Trade which must have impressed with horror every person who read it. It states that, "In the month of March, 1783, the following circumstances came out in the trial of a case of insurance before the Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, at Guildhall. An ignorant master of a slave ship had overshot his port, Jamaica, and was afraid of wanting water before he could beat up again to the island. He himself fell sick. In the course of his illness he ordered his mate, who was the man that gave the evidence, to throw overboard 46 slaves handcuffed: and he was readily obeyed. Two days after he ordered 36 more to be thrown after them, and after two days more another parcel of 40. Ten others, who had been permitted to take the air on deck unfettered, jumped into the sea indignantly after them. The ship after all brought into port 480 gallons of water."

My object in adverting to this horrid story is to furnish you with a more correct and circumstantial account of it, which I am enabled to do in consequence of my being favoured with minutes of the abovementioned trial, taken at the time by a gentleman of the first respectability, and which have since been carefully preserved. The particulars, as stated in evidence, will shew that, dreadful as are the facts related in the above anecdote, they fall far short of the real enormity of the transaction. Permit me to detail it at large.

The ship *Zong*, Luke *Collingwood*, master, sailed from the Isle of *St. Thomas*, on the Coast of *Africa*, the 6th September, 1781, with 442 slaves and 17 whites on board, for *Jamaica;* and on the 27th November following, she fell in with that island; but instead of proceeding to some port, the master, either through ignorance or a sinister intention, ran the ship to leeward, alleging that he mistook *Jamaica* for *Hispaniola*.

Sickness and mortality had by this time taken place. It is needless to state, that previously to the act regulating the transport of slaves*, these evils scarcely ever failed to carry off vast numbers during the voyage; the avarice of the traders inducing them to crowd, or rather to *pack*, too many slaves together in the holds of their ships. On board the Zong, between the time of her leaving the Coast of Africa (6th September) and the 29th November, 1781, upwards of SIXTY slaves and SEVEN white people died, and a GREAT MANY of the remaining slaves, on the day last mentioned, were sick of some severe disorder, and LIKELY NOT TO LIVE LONG.

These circumstances of *sickness* and *mortality* are necessary to be remarked; and also the consequence of them, viz. that the *dead* and *dying* slaves would have been a *dead* loss to the owners, and in some proportion also to the captain of the ship, who was allowed a certain per centage on the proceeds; unless some pretence or expedient had been found to throw the loss upon the insurers, as in the case of *Jetsam*, or *Jetson*, i. e. a plea of necessity to *cast overboard* some part of a cargo to save the rest. These circumstances, I repeat, are necessary to be remarked, because they point out the most probable inducement to this enormous wickedness.

The *sickness* and *mortality* on board the Zong, previous to the 29th November, 1781 (the time when they began to throw the poor negroes overboard alive) was NOT occasioned by the *want of water;* for it was proved that the people on board did not discover till that very day, the 29th November, that the stock of fresh water was reduced, as was alleged,

* Though I am one of those who rejoiced in the passing of this act as some alleviation of a monstrous evil, yet I am of opinion that it stains and disgraces our statute book. What is it, in truth, but an act regulating robbery and murder?

to 200 gallons. Yet the same day, or on the evening of it, *before any soul had been put to short allowance*, and before there was any present or *real want* of water, the master of the ship called together the officers, and told them to the following effect, 'that if the slaves died a natural death, it would be the loss of the owners of the ship: but if they were *thrown alive into the sea, it would be the loss of the underwriters,*' and to palliate this inhuman proposal, the master, *Collingwood*, argued, that it would not be so cruel to *throw the poor sick wretches* (meaning the slaves) *into the sea*, as to suffer them to linger out a few days, under the disorders with which they were afflicted. To this scheme the mate (whose name was *Kelsall*) objected at the first, and said '*there was no present want of water* to justify such a measure.' But *Collingwood* prevailed upon the rest of the officers and crew to listen to his proposal, and on the same evening, and during two or three following days, he caused to be picked out from the ship's cargo 133 slaves, all or most of whom were sick, and thought not likely *to live, and* ORDERED THE CREW BY TURNS TO THROW THEM INTO THE SEA, which order was readily complied with. It appeared by the evidence of Mr. *Stubbs*, late Governor of Anamaboe, then a a passenger, and of the chief mate *Kelsall*, that on the 29th November, 54 persons were actually thrown overboard *alive*, and that on the following day 42 more were also thrown overboard.

On the second day after this barbarous murder had been committed, viz. on the 1st of December, and *before the stock of water* was consumed, there fell a plentiful rain, which was admitted to have "*continued a day or two,*" and which enabled them to collect *six casks of water*, which was "FULL ALLOWANCE for 11 days, or for 23 days at half allowance," whereas the ship actually arrived at Jamaica in 21 days afterwards, viz. on the 22d December, 1781. They seem also to have had an opportunity of sending their boat for water, no less than 13 days sooner, viz. on the 9th December, when they "*made the west end of Jamaica distant two or three leagues only,*" as was stated by a person who was on board; so that the six casks of rain water caught on the 1st and 2d of December, (only seven days before this opportunity of obtaining water from *Jamaica*) was not only a *providential* supply, but may perhaps be viewed as *providentially* demonstrating the iniquity of pretending a *necessity* to put innocent men to death, through the *mere apprehension of a want*, which, even supposing it had taken place, could not have afforded an admissible justification of the horrible deed; but which did *never really exist or take place at all* in their case; their stock of water having never been actually consumed.

But this is not all. Notwithstanding this supply, and the proof which it afforded of the possibility of obtaining *further supplies by rain*; and although they had the additional hope of being able to hold out with their increased stock of water, till they might chance to meet with some ship, or be able to send to some island for a further supply; they nevertheless *cast* 26 *more human persons alive into the sea*, EVEN AFTER THE RAIN! whose hands were also fettered. And this act was done, it seems, in the sight of many of the unhappy slaves who were upon deck at the time. And such an effect had the sight on them, that apprehending a similar fate, and dreading, it would seem, the being fettered, ten more of them in despair jumped overboard, and were *likewise drowned!*

All these facts, it is never to be forgotten, came out, not upon the trial of *Collingwood* for murder, but upon a civil suit instituted by the owners, for the purpose of recovering from the underwriters, the value of the slaves thus cruelly murdered. And, still more strange to relate, the owners gained their cause, while the agents in this horrible transaction were not even questioned criminally upon it.

No comment can add to the impression which these atrocities are calculated to leave on the reader's mind. And does not the blood of these murdered Africans, and of hundreds of thousands, who in various ways have been equally the victims of British avarice, cry for vengeance upon us? This is an awful consideration, which you indeed, Mr. Editor, have not forgotten to press upon the national conscience; but which, alas, is too much overlooked, in estimating our state and our prospects, even by many good men. Let me call on them, as they value the innumerable blessings with which Providence has crowned this Island, to lay it more to heart, and to unite to their prayers, their earnest endeavours to remove that load of guilt with which the detestable slave trade is weighing us down to the dust.

AN ABOLITIONIST.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

On taking up the last number but one of the Anti-jacobin Review and Magazine in a public library, for, without any offence intended to the conductors of that Miscellany, I I am neither a subscriber to it nor a constant reader, my eye and curiosity were attracted for a few minutes to the Review of Foster's Essays; and two or three particulars amused me.

I was amused by the Reviewer's discovery of the religious persuasion of the author. He is, it should appear, one of the people of Mr. Wesley's connection, because he says so much about the influence of the Holy Spirit. By this medium I should imagine that he might, not improbably, be concluded to be a quaker: but I willingly bow to that sagacity, which has found out, that Hooker was an Arminian, and that Mr. Pearson, Mr. Cooper, and the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers entertain precisely the same sentiments on the subject of human corruption*.

I was amused by the Reviewer's claiming with so much eagerness Mr. Foster as an Anti-Calvinist, for a sentiment in which many reputed Calvinists would heartily concur†. Even according to the worst construction of the doctrine of Calvin himself, does the Reviewer think that that Reformer had attained the ne plus ultra of rigour in his creed? Grotius, not a Calvinist—at least till the Anti-jacobin Review has made him such—will tell him a different story. Having spoken of the doctrine of Calvin, that eminent theologian adds, *Auxit* sententiæ rigorem Genevæ Beza, per Germaniam Zanchius, Ursinus, Piscator, sæpe eo usque provecti, &c. &c. Annal. Belg. l. xvii.—Bezeans, Zanchians, Ursinians, or Piscatorians, would by no means be improper epithets to substitute in the place of Calvinists; particularly, as they convey more reproach.

I was amused, in the third and last place, by the logic of the Reviewer respecting the term Evangelical. This term he considers, or reasons as if he did, as void of signification and therefore useless, because every Christian teacher will assume that his doctrine is evangelical. Upon this principle we must abandon every term expressive of commendation, because every person, as occasion requires, will apply it to himself. We are therefore to discard from the language the words, honesty, justice, piety, sobriety, &c. &c.—at least we can never distinguish a rogue from an honest man, because the rogue will assume

* It furnishes a curious illustration of the theological discernment of these men, that this same Mr. Foster, instead of being an Arminian Methodist, as they suppose, is, in fact, a minister of that denomination of Christians, who call themselves *particular* Baptists, from their holding the tenet of *particular*, as opposed to *general*, redemption. EDITOR.

† It is singular enough that the Anti-jacobin Reviewers should have discovered Mr. Foster to be an enemy to Calvinism: and yet that it should fall to the lot of the Christian Observer to censure some of his expressions as exceeding the ordinary measure of calvinistic opinions. (See the last Number, p. 108, note). EDITOR.

his own honesty as confidently as the other: and so of the rest. I am not quite satisfied neither, that every religious instructor claims to be an evangelical one. I strongly suspect there are some who have no great predilection for the term, and *that*, not on account of its abuse, but on account of its real meaning. Perhaps the Anti-jacobin Reviewer will, on some future occasion, suggest a more significant appellation than that which he would explode, and relieve his own friends at least from the unpleasant temptation of believing, that clergymen of the Church of England must *necessarily* be evangelical preachers*.

TRICEPS.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

If the following lines should meet your approbation, you will by inserting them oblige, yours, &c.

C.

LINES WRITTEN BY A FATHER, ON SEEING THE LAST FLOWER OF HIS DAUGHTER'S PAINTING, PREVIOUSLY TO THE LOSS OF HER SIGHT.

HERE hapless maid, here ends thy playful pains;
Nature hath shut the book—thy task is done:
Of all her various charms what now remains?
To smell the violet, and feel the sun.

In liberal toil thy youthful hands did grow,
Quick moving at thy better sense's call;
That better sense is gone! their task is now
To twist the yarn, or grope the friendly wall.

O fate severe! earth's lesson early taught,
That all is vain, save virtue, love, and truth:
We own it all who thro' life's day have wrought;
But thou hast learnt it in the morn of youth.

Pupil of heaven thou art; compute thy gain,
When dulness loads thee, or regret assails:
All is not lost, for faith and hope remain,
And gentle charity, which never fails.

Now love shall glow where envy might have burn'd;
Now every hand, and every eye is thine:
Each human form, each object undiscern'd,
From borrow'd organs thou shalt still divine.

But thy great Maker's own transcendent light,
His love ineffable, his ways of old,
His perfect wisdom, and his presence bright,
Thine eyes, and not another's, shall behold.

---

*For the Christian Observer.*

TO A FRIEND GATHERING WILD FLOWERS.

WHERE thorny ramparts seem to chide
The hand which steals the flowery wreath;
I've seen thee thrust the thorn aside,
To pluck the flower which blushed beneath.

And thus, M—r—a, as the wheel
Of life leads on the changing hour,
Remember still the sweets to steal:
Elude the thorn to pluck the flower.

When fortune shews a dubious sky,
The East may smile, the West may lour;
Still to the brighter turn the eye:
Elude the thorn to pluck the flower.

In pity to its child below,
If Heaven the cup of comforts sour,
The lesson learn, but chase the woe:
Elude the thorn, but pluck the flower.

But then—ah, shun the sweets which grow
Where pleasure paints her poison'd bowers;
Dark are those streams which gently flow,
And rude the thorns which guard her flowers.

And seek thy sweets on holier ground,
And where religion's altars rise:
Her's are the thorns which never wound,
And her's the flower which never dies.

E.—Y. D. R.

---

* We have received a letter from a correspondent, who signs himself *Anti-Venom*, in which, after alluding to a declaration of the A. J. reviewers, in their Number for December last, that "could any thing induce them to quit their native land, it would be their wish to become the subjects of such a Prince," as the Emperor of Russia; he very generously proposes "to open a subscription for paying the expence of their removal to the dominions of this child and champion of *Anti-Jacobinism*, with whom they are enraptured;" for, he adds, "we could well spare them." After deliberating, however, upon this proposal, we have not thought it advisable to recommend it to our readers. EDITOR.

# REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*The Christian System unfolded in a Course of Practical Essays on the principal Doctrines and Duties of Christianity, in 3 Vols.* By THOMAS ROBINSON, M. A. Vicar of St. Mary's, Leicester, 8vo. London, Rivington's and Hatchard, 1805. Price £.1. 4s.

MR. ROBINSON is already known to the public as the author of 4 volumes of Scripture characters, which have been generally acceptable, as well as of some smaller pieces. In his introduction to the present work he says:

"The author submits to the public eye the following statement of his views of revealed religion, not without fear respecting his execution of the work, but with a cheerful hope of its utility through the divine blessing. He comes not forward as a disputant or a controversialist; but as a plain, practical writer, desirous to promote the purposes of Christian faith and holiness."—"The chief attention of his life has been occupied by these subjects, not merely in the retirement of his study, but in the active performance of his ministerial duties. He has been labouring, not without effect, to establish among the people of his charge what he conceives to be the fundamental principles of the Gospel, and upon them as a firm basis to erect the superstructure of Christian morality, of solid devotion, and of vital holiness. And now with a view to their spiritual progress, and in the hope that his instructions may be remembered with advantage after his personal services on earth are terminated, he sends to them from the press the substance of what he has invariably delivered from the pulpit." (p. viii.)

We much approve a measure of this kind in an old and respectable minister of the Gospel; and we are of opinion that works embracing so large an object come best from men whose judgment has been matured by long experience, and who are even verging towards the decline of life. For the lighter kind of theological combat, for the maintenance of an outwork, or the defence even of a material post, none perhaps may be more fit than some young divines. In the general "defence of the Gospel" let those rather be employed who have often traversed the whole land, have surveyed every district through which they have passed, have fought many smaller battles, and though still capable of exertion are beginning to grow somewhat grey in the service.

We cannot give a better summary of the contents of these three volumes, which are distributed into 93 essays, than by adopting a concise statement of the author. Vol. 1. is said to contain practical essays on the divine attributes, the state of man, and the character and offices of Jesus Christ:—Vol. 2. Practical essays on the person, operation, and fruits of the Holy Spirit:—and Vol. 3. Practical essays on Christian obedience, prayer, and the sacraments.

Of the manner in which Mr. Robinson has executed his plan, we shall enable our readers to judge in some measure for themselves, by presenting them with a few quotations.

The first essay is on the divine origin of the Holy Scriptures. Mr. Robinson, after a short allusion to the external evidence of their truth thus proceeds:

"The Bible contains an internal evidence which proves it to be 'given by inspiration from God.' It raises the mind to the most sublime conceptions, and enjoins the most pure and spiritual worship. It is the only book which describes the misery of our present lapsed condition, exactly as we experience it; and while it assigns the true cause, proposes an effectual cure for the malady we have derived from the fall. It disperses the fears of a guilty conscience; it brings the gracious offer of reconciliation with God, and introduces the believer into a state of favour and communion with him. Its manifest tendency is to meliorate and exalt human nature, to subdue its corruptions, and implant all holy

principles and affections. It commands, it produces, an abhorrence of evil; it inculcates and inspires the love of righteousness. Wherever its influence prevails, it renders the soul superior to the temptations of the world, and opens to its view the blissful prospect of a glorious immortality. Who will hesitate to say, that this cannot be the contrivance of fools and deceivers, but that it proceeds from infinite wisdom, and is decidedly the manifestation of an almighty, merciful, and holy God?

"We might appeal to a 'cloud of witnesses', both ancient and modern. There are innumerable instances of those, who in consequence of this book have been delivered from unspeakable anguish and horror, and have been established in peace, confidence, and joy. We can produce thousands, who have been turned by it from habits and dispositions the most vile and abominable to the love and practice of every thing amiable, excellent, and useful. What is the general character of those, who are most zealously attached to revelation? and what of the persons who hate and reject it? Will not the very striking contrast between the two sorts afford a strong presumption, that our religion descends from heaven. (vol. i. p. 8—10.)

In the 3d chapter on "the *power* of God," Mr. Robinson represents the *mechanism* of our bodies as well as the *faculties* of our minds as proofs of the "*power*" of the divine artificer. In the following chapter "on the *wisdom* and *knowledge* of God," the *sustentation* and *government* of all creatures are adduced as proofs of the divine *intelligence*. It is perhaps difficult, however, thus to treat separately, and yet clearly and fully, of the several attributes of the Almighty. The Scriptures sometimes refer the work, even of *creation*, to the *wisdom* of God. "The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth. By understanding hath he established the heavens." They teach us, indeed, to admire and adore that united wisdom and power which we cannot fully distinguish and explain. "Blessed be God; for wisdom and might is his." "Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever."

We wish that the important subject of "the goodness of God," which is discussed in the succeeding chapter had been somewhat more extended. Our readers will be pleased with the following extracts:

"Could we suppose for a moment, that a malignant spirit possessed these attributes, his wisdom would be no other than a mischievous craft, and his power would be exercised in violence and oppression: they would not therefore claim our adoration or encourage our hope." "But when it appears, that our God is good, continually influenced by a disposition to communicate happiness, and that his omnipotence and omniscience are directed by the most perfect benevolence, we may and we should regard him with the strongest affection and confidence." (vol. i. p. 53.)

"Let every reader review his own history, and acknowledge therein the daily and innumerable proofs of the gracious providence of his God. Let us try to enumerate his favours, though all calculation must fail; for where shall we begin, or where end the account? In helpless infancy, as well as in all the various stages through which we have passed, he has been our support. We are indebted to his care for the measure of health, and every comfort in life which we enjoy, for the kind friends so marvellously raised up and continued to us, and for the many deliverances from dangers and distresses, wrought for us in such a way as we could not contrive or conceive. 'Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name'." (vol. i. p. 57.)

In the character especially of our Redeemer "he hath gloriously evinced the perfection of his goodness; goodness, beyond all calculation, immense and infinite! It is on this subject more than any other we shall be constrained to cry out in profound admiration, GOD IS LOVE. The whole scheme [of salvation] originated from this source; and every part 'shews the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness towards us, through Christ Jesus'." "He proposes the blessing to the most guilty, he invites, solicits, and importunes the most careless and obdurate to accept it, that is, to be saved and to be happy for ever." (vol i. p. 60.)

In a passage which occurs in the next essay, which is "on the patience of God," we observed with pleasure, that the *offer* of salvation is represented both as fair and unequivocal, and also as universal.

"Before judgment is executed, God

warns of the approaching stroke; he calls to submission; he proposes and invites to a reconciliation. He has devised a wondrous scheme of mercy; he has provided and revealed salvation; *he offers it freely to every penitent offender; he urges the acceptance of it upon all; and after repeated refusals, he still waits to be gracious.*" (vol. i. p. 72.)

In a succeeding essay "on the mercy of God," nearly the same sentiments are expressed, but in such a way as indicates more clearly the author's general mode both of thinking and expressing himself on some points which involve considerable difficulties in theology.

"But when we speak of that mercy which is 'unto eternal life,' we must remark that though the Gospel gives a general call, and the Lord declares himself ready to receive, and bless and save all, of every character, who turn to him in penitence and faith, yet those who so turn must acknowledge themselves indebted to him, for disposing their wills to obey the call and accept the gracious offer. They are therefore, in a peculiar manner the objects of his mercy, and they feel their peculiar obligations. Then they fear, and love, and praise, and serve him, and look with admiring gratitude on the high privileges, by which his *special* mercy, not their merit, has distinguished them from others. These are the vessels of mercy whom he prepares unto glory,' and to his free and sovereign choice they owe their hopes, their holiness, and their salvation." (vol. i. p. 112.)

The succeeding page contains a passage to which we are disposed to object, as communicating a somewhat partial view of a deep and awful subject: and there is one expression in it, proceeding, we have no doubt, from inadvertence, which seems to us to countenance an antinomian sentiment. We point it out the more readily, because no one who knows the author can possibly suspect him of any leaning to so pernicious an error.

"'The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him.' The plan was formed" (the plan we presume from the context of each individual man's salvation) "'before the world began,' and it remains immutable, unlike the uncertain compassions and short lived favours of our fellow creatures. It varies not 'among the sundry and manifold changes of the world:' *it will not be finally withdrawn even for our ingratitude:* and its blessed effects will be durable as the throne of David. Such are 'the sure mercies of David.' 'In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee saith the Lord thy Redeemer'." (p. 114.)

When we find a prophetic passage from the Old Testament, which respects, primarily at least, the persevering kindness of God to the collective body of the Jewish church, employed for the purpose of establishing the doctrines of individual election and final perseverance: and especially, when we also read that "it" (namely, as we must presume, the plan of God as it respects individual election) "*will not be finally withdrawn even for our own ingratitude;*" we are led to suggest to Mr. Robinson and his readers another passage of Scripture, which serves at least to guard this view of the subject. "When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die."

We heartily approve of the following sentiment, which occurs in the succeeding chapter, "on the veracity of God," and we can assure the pious author that we are not less desirous of profiting by it ourselves than of urging it upon others.

"We may, indeed, mistake the sense" of Scripture; "and after the most serious investigation we should draw our conclusions with modesty and caution. When we proceed to the study of the inspired Volume we should bring no systems with us, nor aim at the vindication of a party; and especially should we be careful to lay

aside all wrong affections which would cloud the understanding and warp the judgment." (vol. i. p. 120.)

The next chapter is on the Trinity in Unity, and we agree with this pious and, in general, very judicious writer, that "on no point whatever are caution, diffidence, serious attention and devout prayer more necessary."

The subjects handled in the course of these three volumes are so many and important, that we must not attempt to follow Mr. Robinson through each. Suffice it to say in respect to the topic of the Trinity as well as several others of a doctrinal nature, into which we shall not particularly enter, that the commonly received arguments which are the arguments in general the most sound and convincing, are employed to prove their truth:—that an excellent practical purpose is uniformly kept in view: and that if the author occasionally errs a little, he errs only after the manner of other doctrinal writers, not a few of whom sometimes represent a particular proof or argument, to be more clear and strong than the premises entirely warrant; and almost all of whom appear to us to become rather obscure and perplexed when they enter the region of metaphysics. Happily, Mr. Robinson seems in general very glad to make his escape from this ground, almost as soon as he finds himself upon it.

The evangelical doctrines of the corruption and inability of man, of salvation by grace, of the atonement of Christ, of justification by faith alone, and of the operations and fruits of the Holy Spirit, which, together with other doctrines connected with them, occupy the two first volumes of this work, are deemed by many to be the "hay and stubble" of Christianity, to be a corrupt admixture which has added itself to the pure gold, and which ought to be separated from it. These doctrines, according to others, who do not absolutely reject them, are barren theories, subjects of doubtful disputation, means of exercising merely the intellectual talents, dogmas retained even in a rational age chiefly by means of a few zealots, who derive undoubtedly some support to their cause from the records of our own venerable church. We cannot however, too often declare our opinion that these doctrines, now so frequently bearing the *reproach* of being *evangelical*, constitute the sum and substance of Christianity; and that we stand much indebted to such men as Mr. Robinson, who, in an age of religious ignorance and indifference, and in the face of much opposition, have laboured to revive this ancient and orthodox faith. The doctrines indeed must be viewed together: they then constitute what Mr. Robinson terms "the Christian system," so far at least as the term system is applicable to Christianity: for thus they mutually support and strengthen, correct and guard, illustrate and adorn each other: and when they are deeply impressed on the mind, they infallibly produce holy affections; and by this influence on the heart they secure the great end of obedience. The following extracts from the essay "on the atonement," will exemplify our author's method of connecting the grand doctrines of Christianity with their practical effects.

"It is this" doctrine, he observes, "which in a peculiar manner, arrests the attention of the careless sinner, softens the hard heart, and constrains the penitent to weep with unfeigned contrition. Nothing else can cause such genuine sorrow."

"It is the view of Christ dying as a sacrifice for sin, which raises the trembling Penitent from the dust, and encourages him to rejoice in hope. He seems to hear the expiring Saviour say, 'Look unto me and be saved,' and then his fears are dispersed. At least, he ventures to make application to God for mercy in dependence on that faithful saying, that 'Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.'

"In approaching to the throne of grace, if he can present his supplications with any boldness, or expect a favourable audience, it is simply and entirely because he can urge so powerful a plea, 'Jesus Christ the

righteous is the propitiation for our sins.' But if you take away this ground of confidence, how shall any of us presume to draw near to our offended God? or 'who shall entreat for us?'

"The established Christian lives in the habit of a continual and most affectionate regard to Christ as dying for him; and thus only can he make any progress, or even maintain his profession."

"From the sacrifice of the cross he derives his strongest motives for holy obedience, and for vigorous exertions in the service of his Lord. This inspires him with cheerful diligence and fervent zeal, from a sense of his immense obligations. For thus he will argue, when he is fixed in devout contemplation on Mount Calvary, 'I am not my own; I will therefore glorify him, who hath bought me with his blood. The love of Christ constrains me: and I can no longer live unto myself, but unto him who died for me.' Is there any other principle equally efficacious? (vol. i. p. 400.)

Our limits will not permit us to insert the whole of the passage, in which Mr. Robinson shews how "the atonement thus enters into the whole of our religion, and constitutes its very essence." (vol. i. p. 402.)

In entering upon the doctrine of the influence and operations of the Holy Spirit, Mr. Robinson expresses himself in terms, which seem to us too general and unrestrained, and which perhaps tend to bespeak opposition respecting the reception which this doctrine meets with from the world at large; though unquestionably his remarks have too wide an application.

"The subject is rendered still more difficult by the extreme contempt, if not malignity, with which every strenuous advocate for the doctrine is treated. It is seldom indeed, that any candid attention is given even to the most serious and solid representation of it. The very mention excites disgust; every expression is carped at and made matter of offence; and those persons, who might otherwise be accounted sensible and prudent, are sneered at and held up to universal derision, as visionaries, fools and enthusiasts, of a weak or a deranged intellect, as soon as they dare to declare their experience or expectation of the assistance of the Holy Ghost. Who sees not, that it requires uncommon caution and circumspection to avoid occasions of reproach, or even to maintain an argument with those, who are disposed to pervert our words, and turn them into ridicule? Surely this unfairness in our opponents is to be lamented and complained of." (vol. ii p. 21.)

Mr. Robinson however, is far from affirming that this doctrine has not been very greatly abused. And here we are happy to adduce his valuable testimony in aid of our own, respecting the mischievous effects resulting to the interests of vital religion, from the countenance which is given by too many in the present day to those extravagant pretences to spiritual illumination, and those violent impulses and agitations, which are a scandal to religion, and the grief of every sober Christian. See Christian Observer, vol. i. p. 667. vol. ii. p. 571. vol. iii. p. 519, 568, 633, and 641.

"We acknowledge," he observes, "with grief, that sad abuses of the doctrine have prevailed, and do still prevail, among those who contend for it. Nay, some, even in modern times, have made such absurd, inconsistent and extravagant pretences to the communications of the Holy Spirit, that we should be ashamed to be ranked with them, and this tendency to religious wildness has much increased the difficulty of treating the subject of divine influences. We would carefully guard against fanaticism, which, as well as deism, has its dangers; and we should think it dishonourable to vindicate any claims or sentiments, which are not grounded on the written word of God, and will not bear a solid examination. Some we know, speak of their visions and revelations, as if they were rapt up like the Apostle, into the third heaven, and held conversation with its blessed inhabitants. There are those also, who wait for some violent impulse or agitation from the spirit, before they attempt the plainest and most necessary duty. We hear with real concern, that there are religious assemblies, disgraced with shrieks and vociferations which must produce the most shameful tumult and confusion, and which are nevertheless injudiciously, (we would not say profanely) ascribed to the Holy Ghost. Pretences to the gift of prophecy have likewise of late excited an unusual stir among us: and it is grievous to remark, that so many have suffered themselves to be imposed upon by predictions delivered in such language, as bears no stamp of the divine spirit, and leaves no

doubt of the derangement, or what is worse, the wickedness of their authors." (vol. ii. p. 22.)

If proofs of the facts alleged by Mr. Robinson were wanting, they might be procured in abundance from more than one periodical work published in this country.

The following account of the contents of one of the chapters on the illumination of the spirit affords a clear idea of our author's views of this subject.

"The spirit teaches no new truths, but opens the understanding to understand the Scriptures:—guides the humble, and not the self sufficient;—gives spiritual apprehensions, accompanied with, but distinct from holy affections;—does not cherish pride, but the contrary:—does not render infallible, or teach all equally;—is often imperceptible in the beginning, and always gradual in the progress of his illumination." (vol. ii. p. 73.)

We much approve of this general statement; but we do not fully enter into that distinction which seems to be so carefully made between spiritual apprehensions and holy affections. In the course of this chapter, Mr. R. subjects himself, as we think, to some farther animadversions. "Wherein," he says, (vol. ii. p. 84.) "does this spiritual wisdom differ from mere *rational* perceptions? A brief answer may be given: the Holy Ghost enables us to conceive of spiritual things in a spiritual manner." To us this appears too much like explaining one unknown thing by another, ignotum per ignotius. Our author, however, properly adds, "and exhibits to the mind the doctrines of revelation *not only as true but as excellent.*" Even this excellence however will be admitted, and in some sense felt, or thought to be felt, by all who range themselves on the side of the doctrines of the Gospel. And yet Mr. Robinson, as we are well persuaded, would by no means affirm that all the Professors of sound doctrine are truly spiritual persons. The definition therefore is still imperfect. He goes on to say, "the convictions and impressions produced by this light are very *different* from those which are derived only from the deductions of reason." Still we are in the dark on this subject. The question propounded, and perhaps somewhat needlessly propounded, in this place, is "wherein does this spiritual wisdom differ from mere rational perceptions?" And the answer which is here given seems merely to be that it does differ. He proceeds, "it is not possible by any explanation to convey to another, who has nothing more than natural powers however cultivated, any adequate idea of these spiritual apprehensions: for then we could not maintain our position, that they can be communicated no otherwise than by a divine influence. This circumstance therefore, cannot disprove their reality; any more than our inability to make a man born blind comprehend the variety of colours, would disprove the existence of light." There is, in our apprehension, something mystical and unsatisfactory in the passage which we have quoted; and in the succeeding pages, though some answer is attempted to the question proposed, there is a portion of the same obscurity.

Mr. Robinson speaks of men (p. 85.) to whom "the word of God which they might before have read, and studied, and understood '*grammatically*," (surely he does not mean *only* grammatically) "is now in their estimation a new and far more glorious book:" he also speaks of their seeing it "in so *different* a point of view," &c. The *nature* of this difference is the point, which we wish that Mr. Robinson had here more clearly explained. We also regret that in this place he so much appears to oppose spiritual, to rational, perceptions. Surely the Holy Spirit may be considered as exercising his influence through the medium of the rational part of man; and the terms rational and spiritual may therefore not improperly be combined. Mr. Robinson himself seems, in another place, to agree with us

in this sentiment, see page 312, vol. ii. where he says that God "is pleased to work on men in a way suited to their rational faculties, by arguments and illustrations addressed to their understanding and affections." Our author indeed, is certainly in the right in "contradicting those advocates for the honour of human reason, who argue that the influence of the spirit is confined to the affections, and has no concern whatever with the understanding." (p. 86.) We, for our part however, are not disposed to distinguish so carefully or metaphysically as is often done, between the various faculties of the mind. The practice of many modern divines has been to divide the intellectual man into three parts; the understanding, the will, and the affections; and then to shew, in an orderly course, both the corruption of each, and the renovation of each by the Holy Spirit. We do not much complain of this procedure, which is in some degree that of Mr. Robinson. We are of opinion, nevertheless, that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit acquires by these means a character somewhat differing from that which it has in Scripture: that more of metaphysics is introduced into our religion than is to be found in the word of God: that explanations of the nature of the divine influence on the mind become too critical and extended: and that, while the divine is combining with his theology his own definition of the faculties of the human soul, he says more, perhaps, than either the ignorance of some will permit them to understand, or the acute philosophy of others will allow them to approve.

But we would call our readers from this subject to the following excellent passage in the chapter on true repentance. Here all is plain and practical, luminous and clear.

"Unfeigned, genuine repentance will produce deep contrition, not only for certain gross enormities, but for every violation of the divine law, as being in its own nature heinous and detestable." "They," that is sincere penitents, "will extend their view to every article of duty." "They will consider their defect in goodness, as well as their positive commission of evil, as justly meriting the displeasure of their God, and requiring their continual humiliation. The weakness of their faith, the coldness of their love, their stupor and weariness in spiritual exercises, will constrain them to loathe themselves and cry earnestly for mercy.

"Most persons are aware, that they are drawn to some particular sin more forcibly than to any other." "This is the sin which doth so easily beset them:' and this is what hypocrites and dissemblers in religion are disposed to retain." "But true repentance" "requires that this powerful adversary, more than any other, be renounced and overcome."

"Such a conviction and hatred of sin, as we have now described, will be invariably accompanied with an ardent design to repair the mischief, which it has produced. It is not possible, indeed, by any exertions whatever, to effect this: but the true penitent will be disposed to do what he can." (vol. ii. p. 148.)

After enumerating several particulars in which this disposition will be manifested, such as deep humiliation before God; renunciation of all hope from himself, and reliance on the cross of Christ alone for salvation; restitution of every particle of dishonest gain, and vigorous opposition to sin, and to every pernicious principle; the pious and judicious author thus proceeds:

"Such views and dispositions, as we have here described to be essentially requisite in true repentance, are produced only by a divine agency." "The sinner indeed should be addressed and reasoned with, admonished and instructed: the strongest representations of his guilt and danger should be set before him, and the most forcible methods used to awaken his conscience. But in these our endeavours to reclaim and convert, we should remember that all our expostulations will be inefficacious, unless the Lord be pleased to employ us as his instruments; and on him therefore our dependence should be placed. He works by means, and by such means, as are adapted to the constitution of our nature. He deals with men as rational and free agents; he calls to them as such, and by argument and exhortation he inclines their wills to

obey, not compels them by violence. He commands them to repent, that they may be convinced of their obligations to do so; he intreats their ready compliance with these injunctions, for it must be voluntary on their part; and he teaches them to ask and expect the necessary assistance from him. Whether this representation appear to us consistent or no, it is that which the sacred Scriptures every where give."

*(To be continued.)*

---

*The Principles of Religion, as professed by the Society of Christians, usually called Quakers. Written for the Instruction of their Youth, and for the Information of Strangers.* By HENRY TUKE. London, Philips and Fardon, 1805. 12mo. pp. 178. Price 2s. 6d.

WORKS which profess to give a succinct and faithful outline of the principles of any sect which has risen to consideration, if the execution in any degree answers to the promise, are interesting and instructive, even to those of different religious persuasions; and are calculated to do justice, if necessary, to the particular society whose principles it is proposed to delineate, and whose vindication from many unjust imputations may be effected by the simple statement of their tenets. This was the intention of the celebrated Apology of Robert Barclay, a work, which the society whom it defends are forward to appeal to as a statement of their principles, but which has not escaped the censure, that many of the most obnoxious of their peculiar opinions are not propounded in it with the prominence which they really hold in the theological system of the Quakers. Not many years ago this body set forth a short statement of their doctrine in a small pamphlet*; justly supposing, as Mr. Tuke does, that few would be disposed to encounter the rather bulky quarto or octavo of Barclay, in order to attain a just notion of their creed. Mr. Tuke has imitated this example: but how far his work may be considered as accredited by the society which he vindicates, and of which he is a member, we have no means from the author of ascertaining.

The work is written with much temperance and candour, and, we are happy to add, with every appearance of a deep impression upon the mind of the writer of those fundamental doctrines of Christianity, in which all who deserve the name of Christians most cordially agree.

"In this work," says our author, "I have been desirous of inculcating the general principles of religion, and of Christianity, as well as those which are peculiar to our society; believing that we can no longer exist, with any degree of consistency, than whilst those principles are maintained, which constitute the basis of the Christian religion. These, I consider, to be faith in God, and a belief of the immortality of the soul; a humbling sense of the depravity of human nature, and of the necessity and benefits of a redeemer; that this redeemer is Jesus Christ our Lord; that what the evangelists and apostles have written concerning him, is true, both in relation to his humanity and his divinity, as well as their accounts of his many mighty works and miracles, his having through the eternal spirit, offered himself unto God for us, as a propitiation for our sins, and sent the comforter, even the spirit of truth, to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and to guide into all truth." (pp. iii, iv.)

We have no hesitation in saying, that these important doctrines form a prominent feature in the body of the present work, and that large portions, we had nearly said the greater part, of it, may be read with satisfaction and improvement by Christians of every denomination. In some particulars we shall be naturally expected to disagree with this respectable writer, and we certainly do: but we trust, that we shall imitate him in expressing these variations of sentiment with candour and charity.

The subject of war is the first ground of difference which we meet with, and a very natural one be-

* Entitled, "A Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends: written at the desire of the Meeting for Sufferings, in London."

tween us: not however, as bringing forward the general question of the legality of war, but as furnishing our author with a solution, which we conceive to be both illegal and dangerous, of the command given by the Almighty to the Israelites to attack and extirpate the inhabitants of Canaan. "We must allow," says he, "that there have been times, in which divers things were lawful that are now unlawful." p. 24. Does Mr. Tuke mean to apply this observation to things of a *moral* nature? or will he allow that abstinence from war is not a *moral* duty? But if difference of *times* has the virtue to transform unlawful into lawful, why may not difference of *other circumstances* have the same power; and then why may not war be now, or at any other time, lawful, provided the exculpatory circumstance, be it that of time or of something else, attend it? But this by the way.

In p. 29, the following passage seems to require animadversion.

"Highly, however, as these writings," the Scriptures, "are to be valued, and highly indeed we do esteem them, there is not only a possibility, but a danger of placing too much dependence upon them, by preferring them to that divine principle of light and life afforded to man, of which they testify."

If by these expressions our author only meant to condemn a superstitious dependence on the letter of Scripture, independently of that Holy Spirit by whose influence alone it can be understood and rendered effectual, we find nothing to disapprove; but if he meant to insinuate, that the dictates of the Holy Spirit might be different from the Scripture written by his inspiration, and of course supersede the obligation of the latter, this, as it is the distinguishing tenet, so we consider it to be the master error of Quakerism; and if acted upon, productive of the most fatal as well as most absurd and irremediable consequences. We conceive likewise, that it is with great injustice that our author objects to the scriptural term, the word of God, as applied to the sacred Scriptures. p. 30.

Mr. Tuke has, in our opinion, extended the effects of Christ's mediation, without any warrant from Scripture, to a very undue latitude. His principal support seems to be a mistaken interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 22. The unauthorized indulgence which our author shews in his sentiments respecting those parts of the world in which the Gospel is unknown, is calculated to paralyse every effort for their illumination and conversion. The slight and dubious advantages which are ascribed to the knowledge of Christianity hardly mend the matter. We wish that among ourselves there were not many, who while they neglect all endeavours to promote the extension of the Gospel, lay this flattering unction to their religious indifference and indolence. See pp. 36, 37.

"The chief objects," says Mr. Tuke in the following page, "of the coming of Christ, evidently appear to have been, first by the sacrifice of himself, to make atonement to God for us. Secondly, by the sanctifying operation of the Holy Spirit, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to bring in everlasting righteousness."

We certainly never remember to have seen the prophecy of Daniel so applied. We could have wished likewise, not to find the Socinian calumny adopted by Mr. Tuke against those who found the redemption of man upon his previous fall, as if it were in their view, "the effect of implacable wrath." p. 39. In p. 42, perhaps without being sensible of it, this writer follows the papists in confounding justification with sanctification.

In the section "on the influences of the Holy Spirit," pp. 51, &c. we expected to have found a clear and distinct statement of the manner in which the Quakers arrange the respective authorities of the Holy Spirit and of the Scriptures: but here we were disappointed, and in part agreeably, as we do not recollect to have met with any thing upon that

important subject, to which we could not ourselves subscribe, and which we could not almost entirely recommend. We have indeed, at p. 61, to complain of a very unsatisfactory, if not uncandid, note, professing to represent certain passages in the writings of Calvin, Beza, Paræus, Zuinglius, Piscator, *but without referring either to the places where those passages are to be found, or to the author from whom he has derived them.* Would Mr. Tuke excuse us for adducing some extracts from Leslie in this manner?

The section "on divine worship and a Gospel ministry," pp. 70, &c. contains many particulars to which we cannot but object, although we admire and accord with the piety, which animates considerable portions of it. We think the author pleads for dependence on the spirit by arguments, which, if allowed to proceed their legitimate length, would supersede, not only the means neglected by the Quakers, but all means whatsoever;—the meeting together, the agreement upon any regular time for that purpose, the occasional exhortations of the members, in short, the whole discipline of the society.

Our author brings forward, p. 87, the practice of the church of Corinth, described in 1 Cor. xiv. as the model, after which their conduct of public worship is framed; and he considers the argument as so decisive that it is unnecessary to adduce any other. And, indeed, when the Quakers shall have proved, that their society is distinguished by the same spiritual endowments as are recorded to have been possessed by the Corinthian Christians; that the same extraordinary effusion of the spirit, and the same evidence of it, the speaking with new tongues, are discerned among them; we will admit, that they have followed the only true model of a Christian church, and that no other society can pretend to an equal honour. But it struck us as something peculiar, that when so extravagant a stress was laid upon this portion of Scripture, those two verses contained in the body of it, which so decisively forbid the preaching of women, should be sacrificed, with hardly any ceremony, to the supposed preponderance of a few general and doubtful declarations of other parts of Scripture upon the subject. See pp. 88—91. Respecting the maintenance of ministers, we think the system before us equally untenable, and the representations of its present expositor deficient in candour. But we do not consider it necessary to vindicate our ecclesiastical establishment on the present occasion. The reader who wishes to know what we have to say upon this subject is referred to Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity.

As the Quakers reject the sacraments, both of baptism and of the Lord's supper, it cannot be expected that we should acquiesce in the section on that subject, pp. 97, &c. Mr. Tuke has endeavoured to do away the force of the command, contained in Matt. xxviii. 19, by giving a figurative meaning to the term baptize, a meaning, of which, in common with any other term, it is easily susceptible; just as if, because we read of a death unto sin, the inference were valid, that our Lord's death was only a metaphorical, and not a real one. John iii. 5. is unnoticed by our author, and his treatment of the practice of the apostles is not a little singular. Why are the private Corinthian Christians a better authority than the Apostles? We cannot conceive how so judicious a writer as Mr. Tuke generally is, could persuade himself to assert, that the transaction recorded at the beginning of John xiii. implies, that the washing of one another's feet "might with at least equal propriety" (as the Lord's supper) "be now enjoined as a religious obligation on Christians." p. 116. Let any one read the whole passage attentively, and then determine. We are hardly less surprised to find, that the very epistle to the Corinthians, upon the

representation of which respecting divine worship our author is contented that the peculiar form of the worship of his society should rest, is all at once, not only deserted but contradicted, when it displays in its form and authority, the sacrament of the Lord's supper. See chap. xi.

Respecting oaths and war we differ from the author before us. But it is not necessary to repeat what has so often been said on this subject. We refer to Bishop Burnet's exposition of the xxxixth article, for our sentiments on the subject of oaths, and we approve his candid allowance for scruples on this head. Our author has not noticed 1 Cor. xv. 31. (his favourite Epistle) which, in the original, is in the very form of an oath. For our opinion concerning war we may refer to our vol. for 1804, pp. 399, &c. and pp. 614, &c. We may observe here that the reliance upon Providence, upon which the Quaker's condemnation of all war is founded, would justify a total neglect of means on every subject. We know not whether it be agreeable to the principles of Quakerism, but it is a fact, of which we have correct information, that during certain riots, the professors of this mode of religion were as forward in their applications for protection to the civil magistrate as any other description of persons, although, if that protection had been really necessary and actively afforded, it could not have been attended with less probability of bloodshed, than the attempt to take possession of a fort, or to repel an invading enemy. And upon what ground this class of society can refuse to relieve the distresses of those who have been wounded, or of the families of those who have fallen in the defence of their country, which will not equally restrain their benevolence to the greater portion of sufferings produced by other causes, we cannot conceive; unless a supposed encouragement to war be more criminal than at least the same encouragement to vice. The passive and peaceable principles, however, of this sect are perhaps some compensation for the blank which they occasion in the collective and efficient power of a nation.

Respecting dress and address we shall only ask, where is the explicit scriptural injunction which is so rigidly demanded of us in support of our ceremonies?

In taking a review of the peculiarities of Quakerism, we seem to ourselves to discern the defects and aberrations of its original foundation, which, however attenuated and modified by passing through the strainers of more rational professors, discover their existence and effects to an attentive enquirer, and lead him to regret, that a secession from the established church should be occasioned by such insufficient and unwarranted causes. "In every society, civil or religious, submission is necessary to the rules of that society, in order to prevent the licentiousness and confusion which would follow, if every member acted upon his own ideas, without any external restriction." Such is the judicious observation of our author, p. 159. And lest it should be alleged, that such a claim upon the submission and communion of the members of the church interferes with the paramount dictates and authority of the spirit, he again as pertinently observes, that this objection "proceeds on a supposition, which is by no means admissible, namely, that a body of Christians, united in the belief of certain principles, is more likely to be misled, than some of the individuals constituting that body." The church has only to assume, which our author proves it allowable to do, that in its whole discipline it is under "the same divine influence which originally formed its predecessors a distinct people" from the world. See p. 161, in the section "On Discipline."

The conclusion, which is peculiarly addressed to the young people of the society, is pious and impressive: and as far as it relates to

the grand fundamentals of Christianity, which we have every reason to believe hold a high place in the estimation of Mr. Tuke, we cordially wish it success.

---

*The Divine Glory displayed by the Permission of Sin, a Sermon preached at a Monthly Meeting of the Society for the Education of Young Men for the Work of the Ministry among Protestant Dissenters, April* 7, 1803, *with copious Notes and References.* By JOHN PYE SMITH. London, Conder, 1803. Price 2s. 8vo. pp. 84.

*Predestination to Life, a Sermon preached at Lee Croft, Sheffield, April* 18, 1804, *before an Association of Ministers, and published by Request, with explanatory Notes.* By EDWARD WILLIAMS, D. D. 2d Edition, corrected and enlarged. London, Williams and Smith, 1805. Price 1s. 6d. 8vo. pp. 54.

IN our review of a sermon preached by Dr. Law before the University of Cambridge, we took occasion to observe that, in our opinion, that gentleman too much discouraged the investigation of the abstruser subjects connected with theology, and that opinion we cannot help still retaining. We are apt to fear that the sermons before us (which we associate together, because they are evidently of the same family,) are censurable for excess on the opposite side. Not that the preachers venture on forbidden ground; but that they proceed on that which they have taken, with rather less diffidence than might have been wished. We are alarmed at the boldness, not of their speculations, but of their conclusions. The main topic of the one, and a very prominent topic of the other, is the old question respecting *the origin of moral evil*, a question probably coeval, or nearly so, with moral evil itself, and which will, in all likelihood, descend to posterity with all its difficulties on its head. It is handled by the authors before us, certainly with much piety, but with too strong a disposition to cut through perplexities that cannot be disentangled, and then to claim the credit of having disentangled them. We must here, indeed, discriminate in some degree between these authors. Mr. Smith often speaks the language of a mind strongly impressed with a conviction of the inadequacy of all human powers to the full explanation of *the deep things of God*, and professes to expect, though he cannot definitely anticipate, such objections to his positions, as he has "no hope of being able completely to answer." We regret to say, we cannot extend the same observation to Dr. Williams, who allows indeed the *awfulness* of his subject, but whose sermon, together with its retinue of notes, we have in vain searched for a single admission, express or implied, of its *difficulty*.

A professed solution of the great problem respecting moral evil, when coming from men who have plainly paid much attention to religious subjects, seems to be well worth the notice of the Christian Observer; nor is an examination of it at all the less expedient, because the solution seems to us unsatisfactory. We shall, therefore, put together the thoughts which have been suggested to our minds on this subject, by a consideration of the two sermons under our review.

Before we attempt to detail the hypothesis of our authors concerning the origin of evil, it will be requisite to present our readers with some passages from Mr. Smith, in which the nature of sin is discussed. His ideas on this head are confessedly not altogether new, but we cannot think that their antiquity will shield them from attack. We find something to the same effect in one of Dr. Williams's notes; but Mr. Smith is more full.—After asserting (what will not be denied) that "sin is not a substantial being," Mr. Smith proceeds:

"Nor is sin an *essential property* of any being. On that supposition it would be

necessary to the very existence of that being; it would, of course, be an immediate production from the Author of all being Himself; and its presence could not possibly involve any blame or fault whatever in the sinful creature. It must, therefore, be, not an essential, but an *accidental* property of any being in whom it is found.

"Nor is there, we are fully convinced, in the nature of sin, or in *that which constitutes sin to be what it is*, any thing that is *positive*. This is plainly deducible from the negative positions just laid down, but it is capable of farther proof. Every thing positive is either that which constitutes the real existence of any being, or it is a part of the completeness or perfection of being. All positive existence must therefore, of necessity, be an object of the creating and sustaining power of God, the Former of all things, and by whom all things consist.

"But sin is precisely the reverse of this. It is no individual being: it is not essential to the existence, or conducive to the perfection, of any being; it is a fault, a defect, a failure, an imperfection. I would express it thus: Sin, in its abstract or formal nature, is a privation of that perfection, or moral goodness, which ought to be in an accountable creature. Or thus: Sin, or moral evil, strictly and properly speaking, is a *want of conformity* in the disposition, the will, and the voluntary acts of a rational creature, to the only true rule of rectitude, the holiness of God expressed by the indications of His will." (p. 5—7.)

"It may not be unworthy of observation that in the original scriptures of the Old Testament several different terms are employed to denominate sin, and in the New Testament a much larger variety is used; all of which in their native and primary import, strongly express the notion of *defect* or *privation*. These may doubtless be considered as so many testimonies from the oracles of God that the abstract nature of sin is privative." (p. 8.)

"But sin is not one of the works of the Lord. It is a privation, an absence, a defect. It is not among the number of positive beings. It is not among the creatures which the Almighty Maker has formed. Absurd, therefore, and impossible, as well as awfully blasphemous, is the supposition that the Holy God can be the author of sin." (p. 17.)

That sin is not an *essential property* of any being, however little we might be able to conclude it from experience, we have the very highest authority for believing; but we can attach no meaning to the proposition on which our author lays so much stress, "that the abstract nature of sin is *privative*." It is observed by no less a man than Locke, immediately after his enumeration of some of the positive ideas that arise from privative causes: "The privative causes I have here assigned of positive ideas, are according to the common opinion; but in truth, it will be hard to determine whether there be really any ideas from a privative cause, till it be determined, *whether rest be any more a privation than motion**." In truth, every thing may be considered by the mind either privatively or positively, at her pleasure; or, which is the same thing, may receive either a privative or a positive appellation. Motion is considered as privative, and quiescence as positive, when we say of a moving body that "it is *restless*;" rest is considered as privative, and motion as positive, when we say of a quiescent body that "it is *motionless*." In this, and in a hundred similar instances, the positive and privative ideas are, if we may so speak, complements to each other, and therefore are mutually convertible. Even the word *nothing*, as Dr. Johnson justly observes†, has both a positive and a negative meaning, and on the confusion of these two meanings, the quibbling wit of most of the equivocal encomiums *upon nothing* is evidently founded.

The abstract term *sin* seems variously used to denote, either a particular class of mental qualities, or a particular class of actions, or perhaps more generally, a particular state or habit of mind. But in what sense, or with what propriety, either a class of mental qualities, or a class of actions, or a state of mind, can be affirmed to be *in its own nature privative*, we are at a loss to determine. If by this proposition we are merely to understand, that mankind vulgarly affix a negative idea to *vice*, in

* Ess. Hum. Underst. book ii. ch. 5.

† Life of Rochester.

the same manner as they vulgarly affix, for whatever reasons, a substantive idea to *light*, *life*, or *motion*, even this does not appear to be true. Vice is very commonly considered under the metaphor of a disease, and virtue as the health of the soul: but nothing can be more usual than to define health privatively as *the absence of all disease*; and perhaps in all languages it is no less natural to designate virtue by such negative terms as *innocence* or *spotlessness*, than to associate with vice such negative epithets as *impious* or *unprincipled*.

Mr. Smith's appeal on this occasion, to the various scriptural appellations of "*sin and acts of sin*," we cannot think very fortunate. We might naturally expect that the sacred writings, which appear to have been designed for no purpose less than to assist our metaphysical speculations on the nature of moral evil, would take up language as they found it; and, in point of fact, we need hardly intimate that the privative appellations of sin which our author cites in his appendix, from the New Testament, were familiar to the philosophical writers of Greece. Still his argument might be worth something, if the inspired authors always appropriated negative terms to vice, and positive terms to virtue; but the case is, in both respects, completely otherwise, as the reader may convince himself by the slightest investigation*.

On the supposed privative nature of sin, this writer's vindication of the Deity, from the impious charge of *being the author of sin*, is entirely grounded. Every thing that is created must be *positive*; but sin is "a privation, an absence, a defect," and to suppose therefore, that it is one of the creatures of God, is *absurd* and *impossible*, as well as awfully blasphemous. That such a supposition is indeed awfully blasphemous, no man, who is not a virtual atheist, will deny; but after the remarks we have already offered on privative terms, it will probably be apparent that the absurdity which Mr. Smith finds in the proposition alluded to, is merely verbal. The word *create*, originally referring to material objects, and vulgarly bearing a *positive* character, retains this character in its metaphorical use, and therefore cannot, without violence, be associated with words of a simply privative form. Sin may be negatively defined *the absence of virtue*, and it is clearly absurd to say that "the *absence of virtue* could be *created*:" but it is absurd only in the same sense in which it is absurd to say that "the man who just now walked freely out of the room, *created his own absence*." He that uses either the one or the other expression, is guilty, not of a contradiction in terms, but merely of a solecism in language. In the same manner, it would be improper to call the *absence of light* a *creature* of the Almighty; or to assert that he *creates the absence of peace in the world*; but when these negative expressions are respectively changed for their affirmative equivalents, this mode of speaking may be both proper and sublime: "I am the Lord, and there is none else: *I form the light and* CREATE DARKNESS: *I make peace and* CREATE EVIL†."

Since it is possible, although but remotely possible, that our strictures on Mr. Smith's mode of proving that "*the Supreme Being is not the author of sin*," may be misconstrued to imply some lurking doubt with respect to the doctrine itself; we cannot think it superfluous here to assert our thorough acquiescence in that doctrine, and our abhorrence not

* Of *privative* nouns for *virtue*, furnished by the New Testament, the following are a few specimens; αδιαφθορια, *uncorruptedness*; αθωοτης, *id.*; ακακος, *innocent*; ακραντος, *id.* αμωμητος, *unpolluted*; αναμαρτητος, *sinless*; &c. &c. Of *positive* terms for sin; κακια, μοχθηρια, τυφλοω, besides the majority of the particular vices enumerated in Rom. i. and other places. Whoever will take the trouble to look over a few pages of Buxtorf's Hebrew Lexicon, or Parkhurst's, will undoubtedly find similar instances afforded by the Old Testament.

† Isa. chap. xlv. 6, 7.

only of the contrary position, but also of all those audacious speculations which may in any degree fairly tend to unsettle the ideas of mankind on this awful subject.

The hypothesis of Mr. Smith and Dr. Williams respecting the origin of moral evil is now to be considered; a hypothesis which seems to be the result of some thought, and which is supported with some acuteness. Considering that it is maintained by them without any material variation, notwithstanding there is an interval of two years between the dates of these two publications, and, farther that it has been again recently avowed by Mr. Smith in his letters on the death of Dr. Priestley, we cannot but regard it as the accepted doctrine of a tolerably numerous class of individuals, for whom the authors before us may be supposed to be the spokesmen. On this account, however unsound we may think it, it appears entitled to some attention, and must excite in us feelings analogous to those with which we might look upon a sovereign, who, though destitute of personal qualifications, should yet be important as the recognized head of an extensive territory.

The following extracts are from Mr. Smith:

"The Almighty and Blessed God could have for ever prevented the occurrence of moral evil, either by refraining from the creation of free and accountable agents, or, admitting the creation of such, by a sovereign act of preventing power:—but He has not pleased thus to interfere.

"The former of these alternatives is out of the question. Surely all must admit that it is becoming and glorious in the Most High to form a rational creation. We also take for granted that rational creatures are free and accountable agents." (p. 18, 19.)

"The sole and proper origination of sin is from the necessary condition and circumstances of created and finite existence, when destitute of a sovereign prevention." (p. 19.)

"Limited or created natures, with all their essential properties, faculties and powers, are positive existences, are *derived* immediately from God as their benevolent Author, and are necessarily *dependent* on Him as their Almighty Preserver. The very notion of dependence implies that of *mutability*. A being whose existence is contingent and necessarily dependent is, not merely liable, but even *prone* to alteration and change: yea, it must *of necessity* undergo actual alteration, unless the sustaining power, on which it is essentially dependent, be *constantly* and *uniformly maintained*. None but the Eternal and Independent Supreme can claim the exalted character of IMMUTABILITY. Now it is evident, that there are only two respects, or, if I may so speak, two directions, in which actual change in the dependent creature can take place: these are, *improvement* on the one hand, and *privation* on the other.

"Let the first case be that of change in the way of improvement. It is obvious that this can take place only by the *accession* of *more positive being*, that is, greater degrees of natural and moral good. Such accession must, then, of course consist in the actual bestowment of new communications from the glorious Author of all real being. But that bestowment could be no other than an act of *purely sovereign goodness*, and could on no original account be *claimable* on the part of the creature." (p. 20, 21.)

"But the second respect, in which actual change may take place in a created nature, stands on quite a different ground. Let the holy and blessed God refrain from the exercise of his power, in a way perfectly *sovereign*, and which could not be *claimed:* let him only deal with the creature on the ground of *pure* and *absolute justice*, and leave him to the tendencies of finite existence:—and the *mutable* being will *actually* change; the essential *defectibility* of his nature will manifest itself; he will *fail*, he will be *deficient*, he will "*come short*, of the glory of God*;" HE WILL SIN."? (p. 21, 22.)

Dr. Williams speaks thus in his notes:

"We assert, that the *origin of moral evil* is to be found in the *union* of two principles, neither of which considered alone partakes of a *moral* character. These two principles are *Liberty* and *Passive Power*. Liberty, it is manifest, is morally neither good nor bad, but is a mere natural instrument, if I may so speak, and may be termed a *natural good* of which God is the author and decreer. On the contrary, Passive Power is a *natural evil* of which God is not the author or decreer, yet morally considered is not

* Rom. iii. 23. Ηστερουνται.

evil. But this term, being little understood, requires further explanation; at least it is incumbent on me to shew in what sense I use it. My design is not to vindicate the use of it by others, but I adopt it to convey a specific idea, for which I find no other word or phrase more appropriate. By 'Passive Power,' then, I mean, That which is of *unavoidable necessity* found in every creature, as such, in direct opposition to the self-existence, independence, and all-sufficiency of God. In other words, It is that *tendency* to nihility, physically considered, and to defection, morally considered, which of *absolute necessity* belongs to every dependent or created nature. That there is such a principle is self-evident, nor is it probable that any reasonable being will ever deliberately controvert its existence. Now, it is demonstrable that this, from the definition, cannot be the object of divine decree, or of will; for it is stated to be of *absolute* or *unavoidable* necessity; besides, it is absurd to suppose that God has decreed, or produces, any thing the existence of which stands in *direct contrariety* to himself. That it is not a *moral* evil is plain, for the *holiest* creatures are subjects of it—God alone is exempt.

"Let it be further observed, that the First Cause, being goodness itself, impels, whether decretively or efficiently, to *good only*; and of this character is even our being necessitated to exercise our volitions. Yet, when the exercise of liberty, in itself innocent, *unites* with passive power, the offspring of this union is moral evil. This I am fully persuaded, is the true solution of the question, *Whence cometh moral evil?*" (p. 42, 43.)

Without embarrassing ourselves with the *technology* of the hypothesis developed in these passages, it may suffice to seize on its leading features. These appear to be two. *First*; In every created being, as such, there is necessarily a constant tendency to deterioration, which will issue in sin, unless prevented by the interference of divine power. *Secondly*; The creature, however, has, in strict justice, no claim upon the Divine Being for such interference; and in not interfering, therefore, God dealt with man on the principles of pure justice.

When it is pronounced to be impossible that a created being should be free from a natural tendency to deterioration, we are tempted to enquire the force of the word "impossible," as thus employed. The distinction between physical and metaphysical impossibility has frequently been noted, and is indeed, obvious; but it is, in the present instance, so important, that we shall shortly re-state it. That is said to be *physically impossible*, which, though it may be readily conceived to happen, yet cannot happen without a violation of the established course of nature. That is said to be *metaphysically impossible*, which cannot even be conceived to happen under any circumstances, the very conception of it implying an absurdity. It is *physically* impossible that a stone, gently dismissed from the hand, should fly upwards instead of downwards; but yet this is *metaphysically possible*; that is, it is conceivable; for a state of nature can be figured by the mind, in which this event should invariably occur. But it is *metaphysically impossible*, that things equal to the same thing should not be equal to each other, or that the three angles of a triangle should be together less than two right angles; that is, it is utterly inconceivable on any supposition. *Physical truth*, therefore, which is the object of experimental philosophy, is collected from our observation of the invariable agreement of certain facts, as we find them. *Metaphysical* or *abstract truth*, which is the object of geometry and the mathematics, is collected from our observation of the mutual agreements or disagreements of our own ideas, and is immutable.

Metaphysical truths are either *self-evident* or *demonstrable*. It is self-evident that *the whole is greater than its part*. It is demonstrable that *a regular cone is equal in capacity to one-third of the including cylinder*. These propositions are true in the same sense; but the difference is, that the latter may be doubted till the previous and successive truths, on which it depends, are stated, while the former compels instant assent from

every person of ordinary capacity, and, if, doubted, can never be proved.

Our idea of *omnipotence* implies the power of doing every thing that is not *metaphysically impossible*. When, therefore, it is stated that man *could not* have been created free from a tendency to deterioration, we must mean, if we mean any thing to the purpose, that it was metaphysically impossible for him to have been so created, or, in other words, that the very supposition is absurd. Consequently, the proposition that *defectibility must necessarily inhere in every created being* belongs to one of the two classes of abstract truths already described: either it is self-evident, and, to be accepted, needs only to be stated; or if not, a series of intermediate truths can be found, necessarily connecting it with some other proposition which *is* self-evident. It remains to be seen how far it comes under either of these classes: but we think it expedient to premise that, while Dr. Williams strongly asserts this proposition to be "self-evident," Mr. Smith has attempted to *prove* it by establishing two or three introductory theorems. Since it is possible, however, that the epithet *self-evident* may have been here used by the former author in a loose and general sense, we shall lay no stress on the circumstance of this difference between them.

That man is *born* with a tendency to deterioration is a melancholy truth, proved by experience. But when it is asserted that he *could not* have originally been created without it, we must declare that, to our apprehensions, this position is *not* self-evident. To attempt to demonstrate that it is not self-evident, would indeed be a very embarrassing task; but happily it is a task completely unnecessary, the very negation being sufficient for our purpose; for to doubt an axiom is to prove that it is no axiom. Had this, indeed, been a self-evident truth, the question of moral evil could never have been started, or, at least, would have been started in a different form from that which it has usually assumed. No man would have enquired why human nature should of itself have been prone to evil, had the very idea of created nature involved the idea of evil propensities. The sole enquiry would have been, why did a Being of infinite goodness create that which was necessarily prone to degeneration; or, creating it, why did he leave it to the developement of its own nature? We need not, however, observe that the first of these questions has entered into the discussion, and has even made a prominent part of it.

It may be allowed (though even this is not to us in the sense formerly explained, a *self-evident* proposition) that all created nature, as such, tends to nihility. Since it sprung out of nothing, only through the intervention of Almighty power, it must certainly relapse into nothing when the intervening power is removed. Since it became something only during the pleasure of another, it will cease to be something when left to itself. But it is not so apparent, why that which never subsisted but in a state of virtue and purity, should of itself have a tendency to subsist in any other state; or why, when left to itself, if it continue at all, it should not continue in that state in which it was left.

Perhaps, however, it will be contended, that, having professed our belief in the alleged "tendency to *nihility*," we are obliged to believe in the "tendency to *defection*," which, in effect, is only a tendency to *existence in a worse and disordered state*; on the principle, that the greater includes the less. It being conceded that the creature must cease to *be*, when the *whole* of the sustaining power of the Creator is removed, we may be told that the subduction of a *part* of that power must be attended with a proportionate effect. This argument is founded on a confusion between natural and moral evil, metaphysically considered; a confusion sanctioned

by Dr. Williams, when he defines his *passive power* to mean at once both "a tendency to nihility," and "a tendency to defection." Possibly, a tacit reference to the phenomena of the material world, and particularly to those of the body, may be at the bottom of this confusion. Of the whole portion of divine power which may be supposed to sustain the body, if a part only be applied, we may expect the body to exist, but in a diseased and imperfect condition; and by analogy, if the Almighty leaves the soul in any measure to itself, it may appear likely that the soul shall still exist, but in an imperfect, that is, in a depraved condition. The analogy, however, is fallacious. Bodily disease naturally leads to death, and may be said to be included in it, as the less in the greater; for every disease deranges, in some manner, the animal functions, and every derangement of the animal functions would be mortal, if it were sufficiently violent. But a tendency to moral defection can have no connection with a tendency to non-existence, nor can form any part of it, because natural and moral evil differ in *kind*. As far as human conceptions extend (and this is the very point in dispute), the principle of vitality in its strongest exercise is consistent with the highest degree of moral depravity. We may accumulate together ideas of iniquity, and travel from one degree of corruption to another; —but after we have travelled without limit, we shall find ourselves no nearer to the idea of annihilation. On the other hand, we may mentally trace the vivifying principle of rational nature, from its most vigorous state, through successive stages of decay, till it vanishes "in thin air;" but moral evil will not form one of these stages. Admitting, therefore, that if the supporting hand of the Creator be partially withdrawn, a created being must be in *some* worse state than before, yet that this worse state will be a state of moral depravity, is, à priori, by no means apparent.

But this account of moral evil may be somewhat differently stated. If we are to discriminate between that part of divine power which preserves a created being in existence, and that part which preserves him in virtue, then (we may be told) it is more than ever conceivable that the former power may continue to operate when the latter is withdrawn; and consequently that God may have sustained the existence of man, while he left his moral faculties to themselves. Thus then, it will be pretended, the origin of moral evil is explained; for, by the supposition, man continued in being, but was no longer virtuous, and to be no longer virtuous is to become vicious. The fallacy of this reasoning does not lie very deep. Two hypotheses may be entertained with respect to the influence of the Deity over the moral faculties of man, while man was yet innocent. The first hypothesis supposes that the Deity furnished man with all the powers necessary to consitute a rational agent, but that the application of those powers he left to the unbiassed volition of the agent himself; and that, therefore, man owed his moral *qualities* to himself, while he owed his moral *faculties* to his maker. The other hypothesis maintains that, where *mind* is concerned, there is no room for the distinction between a power and the exercise of that power; that, whatever abstract terms we may coin, moral faculties are, in reality, no more separable from moral qualities than matter is separable from its properties, it being impossible to conceive propensities that are propense to nothing, affections that cleave to nothing, a will that wills nothing, and a moral character without any thing characteristic; and, by consequence, that we must suppose the Deity to have continually, and by the same act, both kept alive and directed the faculties which constituted man a moral agent. On either of these suppositions it seems improper, if not absurd, to enquire, what would

follow, if man were suffered to exist, but were no longer directed to virtue by divine influence. On the former hypothesis the case cannot be put, since by the terms of that hypothesis, man was never directed by divine influence at all. On the latter, it is no less strange to ask, what would become of the moral faculties if they were preserved in being, but were no longer under divine direction, than it would be preposterous to demand, what would become of a man if he continued to exist, but were no longer a man? Unless a third hypothesis can be framed, this dilemma seems inevitable.

If, indeed, it be once conceded that corruption is inherent in human nature (and such unfortunately we find to be the fact), *then*, it is correct to affirm that man, when virtuous, acts under providential guidance, and that when left to himself, he falls into vice. Then, it may truly be said, in the language of Dr. Williams, that when the divine support is removed, the futurition of moral evil is *certain*. Then, in fine, the hypothesis of this gentleman becomes, as a statement of facts, altogether just: but to say of a hypothesis that it becomes just, only when we have previously assumed all that it was intended to establish, is to confer upon it very measured praise.

As, therefore, the leading position of this author is by no means self-evident, so also, as we have attempted to shew, a good demonstration of it is hardly to be expected. At least, those which have occurred to us, we have shewn to be unsatisfactory. But it is now time to consider whether Mr. Smith, who endeavours to lay down a formal proof of the same theorem, has been at all more successful.

The links of Mr. Smith's proof are as follows: That which is created, must be dependent; that which is dependent, must be mutable; it cannot, however, of itself, change for the better, because this supposes an accession of something that it has not; it must be mutable, therefore, only on the side of loss; consequently, when the power on which it depends, is lessened, it will change for the worse; that is, the created being will sin. Here, therefore, *dependence* is supposed to imply *mutability; mutability* turns out to be *essential defectibility;* and *defectibility* issues in *defect*. The modesty and piety with which this demonstration is propounded, while they dispose us to regard it with candour, at the same time encourage us to criticize it with freedom. It will be found, we believe, to coincide, in part, with the proofs which we ourselves have conjecturally offered of this hypothesis, and to involve nearly the same fallacies. Previously, however, to any remarks on the positions which Mr. Smith successively lays down, we must remind the reader that it is not the truth of these positions which is here to be disputed, but their *necessary, metaphysical,* or (if we may so term it) *a-priori* truth; and consequently, that if any one of them can be shewn to be deniable without a metaphysical absurdity, the whole chain is instantly broken.

That *all created nature depends upon God,* is true. That *whatever is dependent must be mutable,* is also true in the sense in which our author maintains it; for we understand him more particularly to mean this,—that whatever is dependent must undergo some change of state, when it is deprived of the support on which it depends. A ship, stationary in port, *depends* on her anchor; but parting her anchor, she is driven out to sea, and thus *changes* her stationary position for a state of motion. A ship at sea, and sailing, *depends* on the wind; but, the wind suddenly dying, she is becalmed, and thus *changes* a state of motion for a state of rest. But these familiar instances, in which the principle of mutability operates so differently, prove how necessary it is, in every case, to understand the nature of the

dependence, before we venture to predict the *change*, to which the disappointment of that dependence will lead. All the powers and faculties of every created being depend upon the Almighty, and when he ceases to uphold them they sink into nothing. The dispositions to holiness and virtue with which man was created, in like manner, depended upon the Almighty, and when he quits his grasp upon them, they must vanish. But the question is, why they must be succeeded by certain other dispositions of an exactly opposite nature? If the possible extinction of good inclinations be implied, as it certainly is implied, in the original idea of their dependence upon the Supreme Being, it yet does not follow that the possibility of a change from *good* inclinations to *bad* inclinations is also implied in the same idea.

No man will, we believe, contend, or at least will contend after a little reflection, that, if sin had never "entered into the world," the possibility of its entrance could, without a divine revelation, have been *certainly* known. While man had never known any inclinations but such as were good and holy, he could not have been *certain* that these were not *essential* parts of his moral nature: having never seen them separated from his moral nature, he could not have *certainly* concluded that they were separable: and therefore, unless we suppose him otherwise instructed from heaven, he must have thought it *possible* at least that the extinction of his virtue by the sufferance of the Deity would be, in effect, the extinction of his moral nature. But to say that such or such consequences could not certainly have been known to flow from a particular event, till they did actually flow from it, is to say in other words, that they cannot *a priori* be proved to be its *necessary* consequences.

The analogy between natural and moral evil, to which Mr. Smith, like Dr. Williams, makes an implied reference, we have already attempted to shew, is fallacious and unsatisfactory. A machine is dependent upon its owner, and if he neglects to repair it, becomes *out of order*, while it still subsists in its former character: but this case bears no resemblance to that of a reasonable being, continuing to exist, but morally depraved. The machine can suffer but one sort of evil: the fracture of a wheel or the loosening of a cog is an evil of the same kind as the entire destruction of the whole system; while the extinction of human existence, and the deterioration of moral character, are, in the idea of every man, *incommensurable*. Yet even here, analogies more just, may be found. Pieces of machinery, for example, constructed for useful purposes, do not, when out of order, always and necessarily become worse than useless. The spring of a cupping-glass may be relaxed, or the mechanism of a coining-mill deranged; but these useful instruments of art are, in such cases, reduced only to simple inefficiency. Certainly, they are not changed into any thing like *contraries*. The coining-mill does not become a crucible, nor is the cupping-glass metamorphosed into a blunderbuss. If now we suppose these mechanical inventions to be endowed with moral consciousness, the *non sequitur* here instanced would equally hold, and the application of the case to the origin of moral evil, however ludicrous, cannot be thought altogether absurd.

We are well aware that Mr. Smith might be apt to meet all this, by urging upon us the notion of the "*privative* nature of sin;" a notion, of which, as the justness has not been proved, so we apprehend, the meaning will never be explained. He might, perhaps, tell us, that since sin is only the privation of virtue, when the Creator no longer upheld the virtue of man, sin must have necessarily begun to exist. Largely as we have commented on this idea of the abstract nature of sin, we shall

again shortly notice it in its new connection.

The utmost which human imagination can make of the position that "sin is a privative" seems to be this simple truism, that sin and virtue are destructive of each other; whence it follows, that they cannot be co-existent. From the incompatibility of two things, it may fairly be deduced, that *but one* of them can exist at a time: but it seems a strange deduction that one or other of them *must* exist. There may evidently be a third supposition, that *neither* may exist. But this third supposition is overlooked, when, from the simple incompatibility of sin and virtue, it is inferred that the non-existence or destruction of the one implies the existence of the other: and since something else may be supposed, the inference is not a *necessary* inference.

It may be suggested that this *is* a necessary inference, provided only we suppose, what is perfectly supposeable, that the moral powers in the abstract are distinct from any particular bias either to vice or to virtue, though always accompanied by either the one or the other, or, (as it was before expressed) that the moral faculties are distinct from the moral qualities. In this case, it will perhaps be said, when the Creator ceased to direct the mind of man to virtue, he yet left him his moral faculties entire; and, since the existence of moral faculties supposes the alternation of vice or virtue, the cessation of a good influence must have been instantly followed by the existence of bad propensities: on this ground, the hypothesis of our author may still be thought just. The question however, be it observed, is not, whether we suppose the moral faculties and moral qualities to be distinct, but whether we suppose them to be *necessarily* distinct. If we do not suppose them to be necessarily distinct, we must conceive it to be possible that they may be identified, that is, that a new set of moral qualities is the same thing as a new set of moral faculties; if we can conceive this to be possible, we can conceive that the hypothesis which presumes the fact to be otherwise, *may* be false; and that which may be conceived to be false, cannot be metaphysically true.

Another view may be taken of this subject. All vice and virtue, it will be allowed, must begin with *desire*. As far as the question of moral evil respects man himself, if the existence of evil desires be explained, every thing is explained. But the hypothesis of the two writers before us maintains, that as soon as the controlling influence of God over man was removed, these evil desires broke out of themselves, and by consequence, that they were always bound up in the human heart. This seems only saying, that evil exists now, because it existed at first.

Surely, if we know any thing on this subject, we know that human nature itself was entirely and radically changed by the fall. Yet, if we were required to delineate it in its present state, we could say little worse than that man was defectible, and that, when not restrained by divine grace, he would fall into sin. But these, or tantamount expressions, are the very terms in which the authors before us describe the state of man *previously* to his fall; thus, it should seem, making corruption *natural* to the human heart even in a state of innocence.

Having disputed, and, we trust, fairly, the position that every created being, if endued with moral powers, has a necessary tendency to moral deterioration, there is the less necessity for very minutely examining the other prominent doctrine of the writers before us,—that the creature has, in strict justice, no claim upon the Creator for his interference to counteract this tendency to deterioration, and that therefore, in permitting man to fall, God dealt with him on the principles of strict justice. There are, indeed, more cogent reasons than even the study of brevity, for avoid-

ing a very detailed investigation of this question; and our readers will easily conceive them, when they reflect that the familiar discussion of hypotheses, respecting the mysterious dispensations of Omnipotence, is often but ill compatible with that *acquiescing reverence* (if we may so call it) towards God, which is of more consequence to us, than the understanding of "all mysteries and all knowledge." We must, however, remind them, that it is one thing to *believe* the compatibility of the existence of evil with the justice and holiness of God, and another thing to *explain* it. The soundest philosophy leads us to the former; but to the latter, created wisdom has hitherto been found unequal.

Our authors contend that man, having a necessary tendency to depravation, but a tendency not derived from God, could not *claim* the interference of God to prevent the natural effects of this tendency. Admitting, for argument's sake the existence of such tendency, the question becomes, why, and in what sense, had man no such claim upon the divine goodness? "If (says Mr. Smith) the creature can *demand* any thing from the Creator, on the ground of *right* and *claim*, excepting only that which is given by a previous promise of grace," it follows that the Almighty must be "*accountable* and *indebted* to the weak and dependent beings which his power hath formed." This reasoning seems to be founded on the ambiguity of the words *right* and *claim*. In strictness, nothing can be called a *right* for the violation of which there is not an acknowledged remedy; nor any thing a *claim* which may not, by some authority, be enforced. Certainly nothing but insanity can ever maintain that, in *this* sense, man could demand any thing of his Maker on the ground of *right* and *claim;* and yet in *this* sense the proposition must be maintained, before the absurd consequence follows, that the Almighty is supposed dependent and accountable. But we often speak of *equitable* claims, claims to compassion, and obligations in *foro conscientiæ;* and such claims or obligations as these, far from implying (as Mr. Smith intimates) the "supremacy of the creature," are expressly founded on the supremacy of him to whom the appeal is made. It is worse than a confusion of language to suppose that any thing can be due from God to man; the terms of the question should rather be, (though even these are by no means free from considerable impropriety), what is due from the Almighty to his own glorious perfections and to the unfathomable excellence of his divine character?

If, beyond a certain point, the creature can claim nothing from the Creator; up to that point the creature has a claim. If, when created, he had no right to demand any thing more than strict justice, he had at least a right, on this hypothesis, to demand strict justice. Accordingly, Mr. Smith says, that the Deity treated mankind "on the ground of *what they can claim*, the ground of *pure justice*." But how can these things be, if the creature can demand nothing from the Creator, "on the ground of *right* and *claim*, excepting only that which is given by a previous promise of grace?"

It is indeed a problem, insoluble by man, to determine why Infinite Justice and Holiness *permitted* that evil, which yet it could not, and which we know it did not *ordain*. The fact is unquestioned, but the explanation of the fact is, we must say, still a *desideratum*. Dr. Williams indeed can see "no force" in this, and asserts that to *decree to permit* is a contradiction in terms. We answer, it is only a solecism in language; for there is no contradiction in supposing, what indeed we are obliged to suppose, that whatever a Being of infinite wisdom and infinite power permits, he permits *deliberately*. This is indeed a great depth, which the sounding-line of metaphysics will never fathom.

But although this difficulty be not

removeable, we may go farther than our authors have done, in removing its effects upon the mind. We must indeed regret the manner in which they have attempted to encounter it, and lament that, from a vain desire to account for what is unaccountable, they should have mixed with their reasonings some views which we conceive to be unscriptural; and should have in a degree impaired, though certainly without any but the best intentions, the *entireness* of the truth of God. After all that is said about *passive power*, it is not more plain to us that man *has fallen*, than it is plain that he *might have stood*. However we conceive that this might have been effected, and whatever may be our metaphysical conceptions of liberty and necessity, it ought to be distinctly avowed and fully kept in view, that the trial which God made of Adam, was a *fair* trial; that when placed in Paradise, Adam was not resigned to the tyranny of a *necessary defectibility;* and that therefore his failure implied *moral demerit*, and consequently a *desert* of punishment. To us, at least, this seems the scriptural account; and if the system of our authors can be made to accord with it, or can even be held consistently with it, a point that admits of much question, still we must express our concern that the terms which they constantly use (such as *passive power, necessary defection*, sin of *absolute necessity*, and others of a like import) should not have been counteracted, or qualified, by some clear admissions that man might, in some way or other, have preserved his own innocence and the divine favour. We are bound in justice to add, that both the authors before us explicitly assert the infinite demerit of sin, and reject with abhorrence the blasphemy of asserting that *the Deity can be the proper cause of evil.*

Why the ruin of Adam entailed ruin on his posterity, is another difficulty in this subject. Of this too we should always be disposed to recommend a *practical* solution. The question, *why is this so?* may be asked in vain; but he who puts it, may be satisfied that, whatever was the cause of his evil nature, deliverance from it is, under God, within his reach. In whatever degree we may choose to be Calvinists or Arminians, let such a man be told that he is *included in the conditional amnesty* of God, and that the offer of salvation to him is a *fair* offer, not collusive, nor merely stated to be explained away, but implying a *real willingness* on the part of his merciful Maker to receive hin into his favour, through the merits of Jesus Christ. Let him be told that it is of infinitely greater consequence to believe these truths and to reduce them to practice, than to explain them metaphysically: and that he cannot act a part more irreverent towards God, or more detrimental to himself, than by setting the natural perfections of the Deity at war with his moral attributes; by opposing the foreknowledge of the Omniscient to the infinite bounty of the All-merciful; and by thus puzzling himself with philosophical theology, when he should be crying for mercy.

After all, the difficulties of the subject remain: but we need not be afraid of opening our eyes to them, since we have the best reasons for not being staggered by them. On the supposition that *there is a God*, all previous reasoning, whether inductive or demonstrative, from the nature of God or the nature of man, from the world about us or the world within us, would prepare us to meet with difficulties to us inscrutable, in his moral government of his creatures. We might expect them with the certainty of prescience, and foretel them with the confidence of prophecy. It bespeaks then, not the strength, but the weakness of human reason, to be staggered by those events which we could not but expect; to quarrel with our premises, merely because they have led to the very conclusions which we ourselves deduced from them;

to disbelieve the cause, because the effect has followed.

Still, notwithstanding all the powerful evidence in favour of the existence of a great and gracious God, there might be some pretence for rejecting him, if the heart of man could gain any comfort by such rejection. But if, after having broken through the most obstinate truths and the strongest arguments, we arrive only at the regions of comfortless uncertainty,—if, after having boldly blotted out our hopes, we still survive in our fears,—if we find ourselves not only surrounded with the obscurity, but struck with the *chill* of a total eclipse;—then to reject God, is not an act of imbecility, but the height of madness and the worst species of suicide. If the eye of the universe be darkness, "how great is that darkness!" No language can describe the gloom consequent upon the extinction of *infinite light*, or the wretchedness of that being who feels himself immortal only in his wishes, his regrets, and his despair.

Thus much we have thought it necessary to say, upon the perplexities attending disquisitions respecting the moral government of the world, because we conceive that the present attempt to unravel those perplexities has completely failed. We entertain no doubt with respect to the intentions of the authors who have made this attempt: their pages breathe a spirit of fervent piety. But we cannot help entertaining many doubts of the expediency of propounding to the world a hypothesis which seems so crude and imperfect as that which we have been considering; still more of propounding it, even on a particular occasion, in a public assembly; and most of all, of so identifying it with the plainest and most important doctrines of the Christian faith as to make it a part of them, or at least a necessary appendage. Indeed, were the hypothesis less objectionable than we apprehend it to be, our doubts on this subject would by no means be quelled. It is excellently asked by Mrs. Hannah More*, "Who ever derived either practical strength, or mental comfort, from indulging a habit of metaphysical disquisition?" And we are apt to think that the metaphysical cast which the celebrated Mr. Edwards gave to his writings in divinity, has to a certain degree produced an unfavourable effect on the minds of his followers. Where the essential doctrines of Christianity are fully and minutely stated, a certain risk is always incurred of men being led to forget, that the most important of these doctrines are but means to an end; and that the great end of all religious instruction, as of all divine revelation, is no less than the reformation of the human heart. This however, is a risk well worth the incurring, although assuredly every effort should be employed to diminish the amount of the danger, not by garbling doctrines (that were indeed a miserable and self-deceiving policy), but by placing them in their just bearings, and pointing out the surface on which they are to act. But this risk is incalculably increased, where a habit is formed of *holding doctrines metaphysically*, and of mixing them with theories, at the best, of a very subtle and abstruse character, and possibly, adventurous and hazardous in the extreme. It is not enough that all the great truths of Scripture be laid before men: justice is not done either to the subject or to the objects of instruction, unless those truths be expounded in a *scriptural manner*. To translate them into scholastic language, or to systematize them metaphysically, is not perhaps, necessarily to impair them; but it is to expose them to the danger of being impaired, and at all events materially to weaken their effect, by fitting them up for the use of the curious rather than for the improvement of the heart. We need not add that this remark loses nothing of its force, when the philosophical systems of religion, of which we have been speaking, are not even

* Hints, vol. i. chap. 13.

metaphysically correct, and when consequently they are not only of a bad species, but also bad of their species.

Our meaning will be grievously misconceived, if it shall be supposed, that we would dissuade men from the full exertion of their intellect in "dividing the word of truth;" and hardly less so, if we shall be understood to enjoin a total abstinence from philosophical speculations, properly so called, on religious subjects. Such speculations may be useful, in the same manner as discourses on the evidences of Christianity are highly useful,—to repel sceptical objection, or assist the weakness of a sincere but hesitating mind. But for the production of the latter effect, there is another and an indispensable requisite, we mean that *contentedness of the understanding* (if it may be so called), that submission to the will of the Eternal Being, that reposing upon his own merciful declarations and promises, that humility, in short that *practical* devotion, with which a fondness for metaphysical theology is not inconsistent, but to which it does by no means invariably lead.

Here we may express our dissent from Mr. Smith, when he asserts, that "whatever consequences we discover by plain and fair reasoning from sound premises, (whether the process of reasoning be long or short, abstruse or self-evident, difficult or easy,) are as really *truths*, and are as obligatory on our faith and obedience, as the clear scriptural positions from which they are deduced." Not only is this canon liable to misapplication (for in "long" and espepecially in "difficult" processes of reasoning, the danger of mistake increases in joint proportion to the length and the difficulty); but we presume it to be fundamentally untrue, in cases, at least, where the matters reasoned about, are above reason. We have always understood that the majority of moderate Calvinists, avowedly stop short of some positions which yet are, to all appearance, legitimately deducible from the tenets which they profess. Mr. Smith himself allows, that in moral science, an hypothesis is not necessarily false, because "it is liable to unanswerable objections." "Unanswerable objections" are, we apprehend, such as are deduced "by plain and fair reasoning from sound premises;" for if the premises be false, or the reasoning fallacious, the objections, that is, the inferences, cannot be unanswerable; and if inferences so deduced are not to be regarded, then it follows, that we may, "by plain and fair reasoning," deduce certain consequences from sound premises, which yet are *not* "obligatory on our faith and obedience."

Neither can we approve of the manner in which this author speaks, when he seems to suppose that the moral attributes of the Deity could never have been fully displayed, unless sin had entered the world. *Now* that sin *has* entered the world, an occasion has certainly been offered for the further display of the character of God, partly through the contrast between sin and infinite holiness, partly through the pardon of sin by infinite mercy. But we know so little of the modes in which Infinite Wisdom can display his attributes, or, which is the same thing, can impress a clear idea and a lively admiration of them on the hearts of his creatures, that it seems as indefensible on this ground, as it is on many other grounds unsafe, and we will add, mischievous, to argue for the necessity, or even the expediency of the existence of sin.

Still less can we acquiesce in such a position as this of Dr. Williams; *Either the happiness of the creature is not the chief end of creation, or the permission of sin is an act of injustice.* Even supposing (which we are inclined to doubt) that the reasoning which leads us to this dilemma is "plain and fair," yet who can affirm that a little more knowledge than is allowed to us in this imperfect state, might not supply us with

an alternative? We wish too that Dr. Williams, while maintaining the doctrine of predestination, had been more explicit in affirming (what we have no doubt he believes) the real *willingness* of God to receive, without exception, every individual descendant of Adam into his favour, on the terms of the new covenant. Those who hold the doctrine in question, should surely never inculcate it, without thus guarding it against one of the worst abuses of which it is capable *.

* The preceding sheet was printed off before we perceived that we had expressed ourselves, at p. 177, col. 2, in language which may be construed into an admission of the truth of the doctrine maintained by Dr. Williams, as it respects the necessary tendency of all created nature to *nihility*. In a popular sense, indeed, it may perhaps be said (though the proposition will be found 'to fill the ear rather than the mind') that what sprung out of nothing at the pleasure of another, must again become nothing when left to itself; and, for the sake of shortening the discussion, we were willing to concede thus much. We must at the same time confess that we do not quite understand the position that *created beings tend to nihility:* and we leave it to our readers to judge whether there be much more meaning in saying that "what *is* tends *not to be*," than in saying that "what *is not* tends to *be*;" or, in other words, whether a tendency to *annihilation* in that which *exists*, be at all more conceivable, than a tendency to *become existent* in that which *exists not*.

# REVIEW OF REVIEWS, *&c. &c.*

## REVIEW OF FOSTER'S ESSAYS.

A PASSAGE in our review of Foster's Essays (No. for February, p. 113) has been objected to as liable to misconception and abuse. The passage is this: "This letter closes with some severe but just strictures on the great body of evangelical authors." Such a sweeping and indiscriminate censure, it is said with great justice, ought not to have been passed on a large and most valuable body of men, without a very distinct specification of the particular grounds of the censure. Feeling the full force of this remark, we are anxious to embrace the first opportunity of obviating the effect of our incaution, by inserting the whole of the strictures in question, as they appear in Mr. Foster's work. They are as follows:

"I now advance a step further, and observe, that the large quantity of bad writing, (bad in a more comprehensive sense than in reference to the dialect alone), under which the evangelical theology has been buried, has contributed to render its principles less welcome to persons of accomplished mental habits.—Recollect, I am not undertaking to justify their feelings, but merely explaining them.

"The proofs of an intellect superior *in some small degree* at least to the common level, accompanied by a *moderate* share of elegance and of correctness, are requisite to even the lowest form of what can be deemed good writing by cultivated and critical readers. It must have either these combined qualities, or an extraordinary measure of one of them: superlatively strong sense will denominate a performance excellent, or at least able, writing, in the absence of all the graces, and notwithstanding a considerable degree of incorrectness. Below this pitch of single or of combined quality, a book cannot in a literary view please, though its subject were the most interesting upon earth; and for acceptance, therefore, the subject is unfortunate in coming to those persons in that book: a disgusting cup will seem to spoil the finest element which can be conveyed in it, though that were the nectar of immortality.

"Now, in this view, I suppose it will be acknowledged, that the evangelical cause has not on the whole been happy in its prodigious list of authors. A number of them have displayed a high order of excellence; but one regrets, as to a much greater number, that they did not revere the dignity of their religion too much to beset and suffocate it with superfluous offerings. To you I do not need to expatiate on the character of the collective Christian library. It will have been obvious to you that a great many books form the perfect vulgar of pious authorship, an assemblage of the most subordinate materials that can be called

thought, in language too grovelling to be called style. Now only suppose a man who has been conversant and enchanted with the works of eloquence, refined taste, or strong reason, to become an enquirer after evangelical truth, and in the outset to meet with a number of books of this class: in what light would the religion of Christ inevitably appear to him, if he did not find some happier delineations of it?

"There is another large class of Christian books which bear the marks of learning, correctness, and a disciplined understanding, and by a general propriety leave but little to be censured, but which display no invention, no prominence of thought, nor living vigour of expression: all is flat and dry as a plain of sand. It is perhaps the fifteen hundredth iteration of commonplaces, the listless attention to which is hardly an action of the mind; you seem to understand it all, and mechanically assent, while you are thinking of something else. Surrounded by a rich immeasurable world of possible varieties of reflection and illustration, the author seems doomed to tread over again the narrow space of ground long since trodden to dust, and in all his movements appears clothed in sheets of lead.

"There is a smaller class that might be called mock-eloquent writers. These saw the effect of brilliant language in those works of eloquence and poetry where it was dictated and animated by energy of thought, and wished, perhaps very justly, that Christianity might not want any of the recommendations, except vice, that have assisted to make the paganism of ancient and modern genius so fascinating to persons of polished and literary taste. But unfortunately they forgot that eloquence resides essentially in the thought, and that *no language can make that eloquent which will not be so in the plainest words that could clearly express the sense.* Or probably they sincerely mistook their own thoughts for vigorous and sublime, as soon as they had clad them in that gaudy verbosity with which it was easy, after having read verse enough, to invest the most common and spiritless conceptions. But what is the effect? Real eloquence strikes on your mind with irresistible force, and leaves you not the possibility of asking or thinking whether it *be* eloquence; but the sounding sentences of these writers excite you first to a doubtful attention to a language that seems threatening to move or astonish you, without actually doing it; from this you proceed to a curious observance of the manner in which it is managed; and end, not long after, in flat disgust. It is somewhat like the case of a false alarm of thunder, where a sober man, that is not apt to startle at sounds, looks out to see whether it be not the rumbling of a cart.

"A principal device in the fabrication of this style is, to multiply epithets, dry epithets, laid on the outside, and into which none of the vitality of the sentiment is found to circulate. You may amuse yourself by taking a great number of the words out of each page, and finding that the sense is neither more nor less for your having cleared the composition of these epithets of chalk, of various colours, with which the tame thoughts had submitted to be rubbed over in order to be made fine.

"Under the denomination of mock-eloquence may also be placed the mode of writing which endeavours to excite the passions, not by presenting striking ideas of the object of passion, but by the appearance of an emphatical enunciation of the writer's own feelings concerning it. You are not made to perceive how the thing itself has the most interesting claims on your heart; but you are required to be affected in mere sympathy with the author, who attempts your feelings by frequent exclamations, and perhaps by an incessant application to his fellow-mortals, or to their Redeemer, of all the appellations and epithets of passion, and sometimes of a kind of passion not appropriate to the object. To this last great Object especially such forms of expression are occasionally applied, as must revolt a man, who feels that he cannot meet the same being at once on terms of adoration and of caressing equality.

"It would be going beyond my purpose, to carry my remarks from the literary merits, to the moral and theological characteristics, of Christian books; else a very strange account could be given of the injuries which the Gospel has suffered from its friends. You might often meet with a systematic writer, in whose hands the whole wealth and variety and magnificence of revelation shrink into a meagre list of doctrinal points, and who will let no verse in the bible say a syllable till it has placed itself under one of them. You may meet with a Christian *polemic* who seems to value the arguments for evangelical truth as an assassin values his dagger, and for the same reason; with a *descanter* on the invisible world who makes you think of a popish cathedral, and from the vulgarity of whose illuminations you are excessively glad to escape into the solemn twilight of faith; or with a grim *zealot* for a theory of the Divine Attributes which seems to delight in representing the Deity as a dreadful king

of furies, whose dominion is overshadowed with vengeance, whose music is the yell of victims, and whose angels are transformed into a legion of fiery dragons.

"It is quite unnecessary to say that the list of excellent Christian writers would be very considerable. But as to the vast mass of books that would, by the consenting adjudgment of almost all men of liberal cultivation, remain after this deduction, one cannot help deploring the effect which they must have had on unknown thousands of readers. It would seem beyond all dispute or question that books which, though even asserting the essential truths of Christianity, yet utterly preclude the full impression of its character, which exhibit its claims on admiration and affection with insipid feebleness of sentiment, or which cramp its simple majesty into an artificial form at once distorted and mean, must be seriously prejudicial to the influence of this sacred subject, though it be admitted that many of them have sometimes imparted a measure of instruction and a measure of consolation. This they might do, and yet convey very contracted and inadequate ideas of the subject at the same time. There are a great many of them into which an intelligent Christian cannot look without rejoicing that *they* were not the books, or not alone the books, from which he received his impressions of the glory of his religion. There are many which nothing would induce him, even though he do not materially differ from them in the leading articles of his belief, to put into the hands of an inquiring young person; which he would be sorry and ashamed to see on the table of an infidel; and some of which he regrets to think may still contribute to keep down the standard of religious taste, if I may so express it, among the public instructors of mankind. On the whole, it would appear, that a profound veneration for Christianity would induce the wish that, after a judicious selection of books had been made, the Christians also had their Caliph Omar, and their general Amrou. (p. 173—183.)

These strictures, the reader will recollect, are applicable, not to the majority of evangelical authors of any particular religious communion, but to the majority of the collective body of evangelical authors of all denominations.

---

# LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE, *&c. &c.*

## GREAT BRITAIN.

PREPARING for the Press:—*A History of the Isle of Man;* in 2 vols. 8vo.; by Mr. M. LEE:—A new edition of HARMER'S *Observations on divers Passages of Scripture*:—An improved edition of PLANTA'S *History of the Helvetic Confederacy*:—*A Life of Lord Nelson*, with splendid Illustrations of the most remarkable Engagements in which his Lordship was distinguished; to be published by Mr. BOWYER, of Pall Mall, under royal Patronage:—*The Life and Writings of the late Rev.* WM. GRIMSHAW, Vicar of Haworth; by Mr. MYLES, Author of the Chronological History of the Methodists:—*An Almanack of Health;* by Dr. BEDDOES:—*The Stranger in Ireland*, being an Account of Travels in that Country; in 1 vol. 4to. with elegant engravings; by Mr. Carr.

In the Press:—A second volume of *Sermons*, by the Rev. EDWARD COOPER:—*Sermons preached at the Lecture, founded by the Hon.* ROBERT BOYLE; by the Rev. Mr. VAN MILDERT:—*A Treatise on Trigonometry;* by Mr. BONNYCASTLE:—*The Geographical Selector;* consisting of Maps, Charts, and Plans of the principal Cities, Harbours, Forts, &c. in the World; accompanied by Historical and Geographical Illustrations; the engravings by Mr. LUFFMAN; the literary department by T. HARRAL, Esq.:—The second volume of *Memoirs of the Queen of France;* by her Foster-brother M. WEBBER; with superior engravings:—*Memoirs of the Rise and Progress of the Royal Navy*, from the Reign of Henry VII. to the present Time; 4to. by Mr. DERRICK, of the Navy Office:—*The Proverbs of Ali*, with a Latin Translation and Notes, by CORNELIUS VAN WAENER; edited by Mr. MOUSLEY, of Baliol College; in 4to. at the Clarendon Press:—*A Journey through the Countries of Mysore, Canara, and Malabar;* by FRANCIS BUCHANAN, M. D. under the Orders of Marquis Wellesley; published under the Authority and Patronage of the East India Directors; in 3 vols. 4to. with a Map and Plates:—*Letters written during a Tour through the Batavian Republic and Part of France*, with an Account of the State of the English imprisoned at Verdun; in 2 vols. 8vo. by JAMES FORBES, Esq. F. A. S.:—*Chironomia; or, A Treatise on Rhetorical Delivery;* with above 150 figures; in one large 4to. vol.;

by the Rev. GILBERT AUSTEN, M. A. of Woodville, near Dublin:—A Popular Refutation of the Objections against the *Cowpox*, by W. BLAIR, Esq.

*East India College.*

The plan of this establishment comprehends a SCHOOL, into which boys may be admitted at an early age; and a COLLEGE, for the reception of Students at the age of 15, to remain till they are 18. As the School will be rendered introductory to the College, those who shall have passed through both Institutions will enjoy the advantage of a uniform system of education, begun in early youth, and continued till their departure for the duties of their public stations. The College is exclusively appropriated to persons designed for the civil service of the Company abroad; the school will be open to the public at large.

The Rev. M. H. LUSCOMBE, M. A. is appointed *Head Master of the School;* to whom each scholar is to pay 70 guineas per annum; which sum will include Classical Instruction, French, Writing, Arithmetic, Mathematics, Drawing, and Dancing.

The College is to be under the direction and authority of a Principal and several Professors, according to the following arrangement:—*Principal;* the Rev. SAM. HENLEY, D.D.—*Professors of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy;* Rev. B. BRIDGE, M. A. and Rev. W. DEALTRY, M. A.—*Professors of Humanity and Philology;* Rev. E. LEWTON, M. A. and J. H. BATTEN, Esq. M. A.—*Professor of History and Political Oeconomy;* Rev. T. R. MALTHUS, M. A.—*Professor of General Polity and the Laws of England;* E. CHRISTIAN, Esq. M. A.—*Professor of Oriental Literature;* J. GILCHRIST, Esq. LL. D. To the College will be attached a French Master, a Drawing Master, a Fencing Master, and other proper Instructors. The annual charge to the students in the College will be 100 guineas.

The Principal is entrusted with the moral and religious instruction of the students, and the more immediate superintendence of their conduct; and will preach, in conjunction with such Professors as are in Holy Orders, in the College Chapel, and perform the other offices of the Established Church.

The Lectures of the Professors are arranged under four heads: I. *Oriental Literature;* comprising, 1. Instruction in the Rudiments of the Oriental Languages, especially the Hindostanee and Persian; 2. Lectures to illustrate the History, Customs, and Manners of the People of India:—II. *Mathematics and Natural Philosophy;* comprising, 1. Instruction in the Elements of Euclid, Algebra, and Trigonometry; on the most useful properties of the Conic Sections, the nature of Logarithms, and the principles of Fluxions; 2. Lectures on Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Optics, and Astronomy; illustrated by Experiments, and rendered subservient to the arts and objects of common life: with some elementary instructions in Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Natural History:—III. *Classical and General Literature;* comprising, 1. Lectures to explain the Ancient Writers of Greece and Rome, particularly the Historians and Orators; 2. Lectures on the Arts of Reasoning and Composition; and on the "Belles Lettres:"—IV. *Law, History, and Political Oeconomy;* comprising, Lectures, 1. On General History, and on the History and Statistics of Modern Europe; 2. On Political Oeconomy; 3. On General Polity, on the Laws of England, and on the Principles of the British Constitution.

The College year is divided into Two Terms, each consisting of 20 weeks, the first beginning Feb. 2, and ending June 19, and the second beginning August 1, and ending December 21. In the last week of the second Term, Public Examinations will be held; when the students will be arranged in four lists according to their merits; a copy of which will be inserted in the records of the Company; and suitable Prizes and Medals will be distributed.

This plan may be expected eventually to produce happy effects on the concerns of the Company in the East. The education of persons destined to fill the important offices of Magistrates, Ambassadors, Provincial Governors, &c. should certainly be conducted on some such comprehensive plan as the foregoing. The cultivation and improvement of their intellectual powers should be accompanied with such a course of moral discipline, as may tend to excite and confirm in them habits of application, prudence, forethought, integrity, and justice. And to render such a system of education fully efficient, it is essential that it be founded on the basis, and conducted under the sanction, and in strict conformity with the spirit, of our holy religion. Proceeding on these principles, it may reasonably be expected that this Institution, under the favour of Providence, will be productive, among other happy effects, of a benign and enlightened policy towards the native subjects of British India, tending at once to improve their social and civil condition, and to diffuse throughout the Eastern hemisphere the blessed influence of Christian truth.

*** *The Foreign Literary Intelligence is unavoidably postponed.*

# LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGY.

An Essay on the Excellence of Christian Knowledge; with an Appeal to Christians on the Propriety of using every Means for its Promotion. By F. A. Cox, A. M.

The Overflowing of Ungodliness, a Sermon on the Times, preached at St. James's Church, Bath, Sunday, January 19, 1806. By the Rev. R. Warner. Price 1s. 6d.

Sermons on various Subjects and Occasions. By Alexander Grant, D. D. Vol. iii. 8vo. 8s. boards.

A Dissertation of the Prophecies that have been fulfilled. By George Stanley Faber, B. D. 2 vols. 8vo. Price 16s. boards.

A systematic View of the revealed Wisdom of the Word of God. By the Rev. Raby Williams. Royal 8vo. 12s. boards. Illustrated with 14 Copper-plates.

A Sermon preached on the 5th of December. By the Rev. David Brichan. 4to. 1s. 6d.

An Harmony of the Epistles of the Holy Apostles. By the Rev. Peter Roberts, M. A. 4to. Price 16s. boards.

Select Parts of the Old and New Testament, agreeable to the approved Modern Version. By the Rev. Theophilus Browne, A. M. Royal 8vo. 15s. Large Paper 25s.

The Apocalypse, or Revelations of St. John, with Notes. By John C. Woodhouse, M. A. Royal 8vo. 18s. boards.

A Catechism for Youth. By D. Taylor. 6d.

The Seventh Day a Day of Rest. A Discourse by the Rev. Charles Wood.

MISCELLANIES.

The Forest Pruner; or Timber Owner's Assistant: being a Treatise on the Training or Management of British Timber Trees; whether intended for Use, Ornament, or Shelter, &c. &c. &c. By William Pontey, Nurseryman and Ornamental Gardener, Author of the Profitable Planter; and Planter and Forest Pruner to the late and present Duke of Bedford.

Lectures on Belles Lettres and Logic. By the late W. Barron, F. A. S. E. 2 Vols. 8vo. £1. 1s.

The Asiatic Annual Register, Vol. vi.

A Treatise on the Origin, Progress, and Treatment of Consumption. By John Reid, M. D. &c. &c. 7s.

A Vindication of the Cow Pock. By R. J. Thornton, M. D. 1s. 6d.

The Metaphysics of Man, or the pure part of the Physiology of Man. Translated from the German by S. F. Waddington, M. P. 5s.

Elements of Intellectual Philosophy, or an Analysis of the Powers of the Human Understanding. By R. E. Scott, A. M. 8vo. 9s.

Modern Art of War. 18mo. 2s. 6d. sewed.

Effects of Civilization on the People in European States. By Charles Hall, M. D. 8vo. Price 8s.

An Inquiry into the Principles, Disposition, and Habits, of the People of England, since the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. By John Andrews, LL. D. 3s.

A Meteorological Journal of the Year 1805, kept in Paternoster-row, London. By W. Bent. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Humber's Juvenile Miscellany, containing Geography, Astronomy, Chronology, Anatomy, &c. for the Use of Schools. 2s. and 2s. 6d.

Considerations arising from the Debates in Parliament on the Petition of the Irish Catholics. By Sir John Throckmorton, Bart. 3s. 6d.

The Mysteries of Neutralization, or the British Navy vindicated from the Charge of Injustice and Oppression towards Neutral Flags. By John Brown. Price 4s.

# RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

POOR PIOUS CLERGYMEN.

In 1768, a society was instituted in London *for the Relief of poor pious Clergymen in the Established Church residing in the Country.* Its object is so very important that we feel it our duty to make our readers acquainted with it. "The life of a minister," it is justly observed by this society, "is and must be a warfare, in any situation; but when besides his various exercises as a *minister*, his feelings as a man are incessantly agitated by the superadded pressure of poverty: when the hours he would devote to the edification of his peo-

ple are embittered by the intrusion of anxious care how to avoid contracting debts, or how to discharge them: when the anguish with which the distresses of a wife or children must affect a tender mind, follows him into the study and into the pulpit"—"the hardships of such a man, engaged in such a cause, call loudly for compassion, and if possible, for relief." Considerations of this kind have given rise to the present design, which proposes to advance the progress of religion in the Established Church, by assisting such exemplary clergymen as labour in the word and doctrine, and from the smallness of their income are subjected to distress and discouragement.

It will be unnecessary in this place, to detail the rules of the society which appear to us to be judiciously framed, as any person who wishes to become acquainted with them may easily ascertain, by applying to Ambrose Martin, Esq. 22, Finch Lane, Cornhill; Mr. Gilbert, Goldsmith to the King, Cockspur Street, Charing Cross; Rev. W. Goode, Rectory House, Blackfriars; and Mr. J. W. Coffin, 21, Sherborne Lane: also to G Thorne, Esq. Wine Street, Bristol; Mr. Bielby, Birmingham; Rev. E. Edwards, Lynn, Norfolk; all of whom also receive subscriptions. A few extracts, from letters received by the Committee in the course of the last year, will afford ample proof of the excellence and utility of this institution.

"REV. SIR, *Jan.* 19, 1805.

"It is incumbent upon me always to acknowledge, with gratitude, the manifold supplies I have received time after time from your well disposed and benevolent Committee; and I feel myself highly indebted to every member of this good fund. I trust that I need not make any long apology in my own defence; but this I may truly affirm, that necessity has hitherto compelled me to be thus annually troublesome to you. Yet I have not the least reason to complain, since Providence has ever been merciful and gracious unto me, in supplying my wants."—"Having at present *nine* children to support at the yearly stipend of 40*l.*, which is reckoned a tolerable good salary in this part; (but I must say, that it is too scanty to maintain such a family as mine with the necessaries of life;) may I therefore be permitted to crave herein some little more assistance: and may Heaven abundantly reward you."

"REV. AND DEAR SIR, *Feb.* 22, 1805.

"By the seasonable and valuable assistance I received through your medium, last year, I was enabled to pay my debt, and to procure many things necessary for the use of my family."—"My salary, from the three laborious curacies I continually serve, is only 45*l.* per annum, which I find too scanty to procure the necessaries of life, for my large and increasing family."

"As our children advance in years, grow in stature, and increase in number, their wants also very much increase. We are *now eleven* in family; the necessaries of life are dear; my small stipend is inadequate to support so many; I am therefore compelled to repeat my application to your Society, this year also, to solicit their benevolent aid: though it is very painful to my feelings to be so troublesome to you."

"GENTLEMEN, *April* 24, 1805.

"I am under the necessity of again soliciting your assistance."

"My time is wholly taken up in the duties of this place. I read prayers and preach four times a week, do all the parochial duty, and superintend the schools. The congregation upon an average is about 1000 persons, chiefly the labouring poor."

"And it is, I trust, with unfeigned thankfulness to God, for your excellent Society, that I mention, that, but for the assistance which it has afforded me, for several years past, I must have been driven from my post, or sunk at it covered with disgrace, as unable to pay my way. My legal income has somewhat increased this year, being about 80*l.* This has been aided by subscriptions and donations amounting to about 40*l.* more, but a considerable part of this has been applied to the discharge of debts formerly contracted for necessaries. Since I solicited the aid of the Society about this time last year, I have had another daughter born, making my number of daughters seven; and I have two sons; so that with a servant we are *twelve* in family, all maintained at my own expence."—"My situation is such, that I am called upon to make a decent appearance, and to do this with my large family I feel a heavy burden. And, having rent and taxes to pay, I find my income greatly inadequate to my necessary expenditure."—"Had I not some hope in the interposition of a kind and gracious Providence, my spirits must give way, and I should be inadequate to the duties of my station. If therefore you should be pleased again to grant my petition, and afford assistance, great will be the consolation which will be administered to me and to my dear partner: and I hope the help will be applied to the furtherance of the cause of Him, who 'though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor'."

"REV. AND DEAR SIR, *July* 2, 1805.

"It is not unknown to your worthy body, that my whole preferment in —— —— amounts to 48*l.* a year, with which I have a wife and large family to maintain, consisting altogether of ten children. This pittance would never have been sufficient for support, had I not received when in ———, frequent assistance from Lord ———, and in London, partly through his recommendation, from the Marquis of ———, who, in his own hand-writing, bears honourable testimony to my character in a letter to Lord ———, a copy of which I have annexed for your perusal. —— ——, the patron of my church preferment, withholding its small stipend, has been, humanly speaking, the cause of these present trials."

"My wife is now at ——, in a hot, close, confined lodging, at 1*s.* 8*d.* a week. It has pleased the Lord to visit one child with the small-pox, three with the fever. Concerning the life of the former, I have but little hopes, and humbly bend in submission to the will of God, knowing that present trials work together for good when sanctified."

"REV. AND DEAR SIR, *July* 27, 1805.

"Permit me to become a petitioner once more, through your kind hand, to the worthy Gentlemen of the Committee, for a renewal of that comfortable relief, which they tenderly bestowed upon me and my family in the course of last year."—"I have four young boys and a girl, and one of the boys is very sickly. My stipend, as I mentioned last year, clears me about 30*l.* per ann."

"DEAR SIR, *Dec.* 14, 1804.

"I have this morning received your kind letter, covering a note of ——. I want words to express the grateful sense I feel, first, to my heavenly Father, who, whilst he takes away with one hand, returns it with the other: and secondly, to the Gentlemen, who have thus *generously* and *handsomely* contributed to the relief of my necessities. Believe me, Sir, the difficulties I have had to rub through, have often paralized my ministerial labours, and I fear, greatly abridged my usefulness. Yet I have consoled myself with this idea, that, if I was not *doing*, I was *suffering* the will of God. Accept, Sir, my best thanks for your Christian conduct upon the present occasion."

"REV. AND DEAR SIR, *July* 9, 1805.

"It is impossible to express on paper what I feel for your beneficence."—"I return humble and hearty thanks to the Lord for the providential meeting with you, which has been attended with the most beneficial consequences. Most worthy brother, whom I shall always love in our common Lord, be my friend once more; and since my tongue is too feeble, let your's be the organ of my gratitude to your worthy Society for their vote of ——. Tell them, they have restored a husband to his wife, a father to his children, a pastor to his flock. Tell them, they shall have the prayers and blessings of thousands, that a blessing from above may be always on them; that they may be blessed in their families and persons here; blessed in time; and blessed in eternity; that they may be found among those whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life."

"REV. AND DEAR SIR, *Sept.* 11, 1805.

"I received your favour this morning inclosing a bank post bill, value ——, for which I return you and the whole Committee my most sincere thanks. May the God of all grace reward you, and all my benefactors, for the liberal relief you have afforded me, under my present trying circumstances. I have laboured, I trust with some success, in this neighbourhood for many years; but since I lost the curacy of ——, my salary was so much reduced, that all my hope was nearly gone of standing to my post here much longer, as my family is become large; but your benefaction will be the means of my continuance, for some time, amongst a people whose spiritual welfare lies near my heart."

The Society we perceive has distributed during the last year the sum of £.1360; a sum which though considerable, is doubtless very inadequate to the numerous claims which may be justly preferred to the benevolence of such an institution.

## EAST INDIES.

Two of the Missionaries belonging to the London Society, and whom we lately mentioned to have arrived at Tranquebar, have proceeded to Vizagpatnam, with the view of establishing a mission among the Gentoos in that quarter. At this place they met with a cordial reception from the principal Europeans, one of whom, a Magistrate, had been in the habit of performing divine service himself, in the court-house, before the Gentlemen of the settlement, the soldiers in garrison, and some half cast people. On the arrival of the Missionaries,

they were requested to undertake this office, to which they readily assented; and their services have since been remunerated by a small salary.

The town of Vizagpatnam contains about 20,000 inhabitants, chiefly idolaters, and the neighbourhood is also very populous; but the Missionaries must defer the commencement of their labours among the natives, until they shall have made themselves masters of the language spoken in that district which is the Telinga or Gentoo. Their study of this language has been providentially facilitated by means of a manuscript dictionary given them by a gentleman who was about to return to England. In the mean time they have an opportunity of preaching to the Europeans in Garrison, and of engaging in the instruction of youth; employments which may be relinquished in favour of fresh Missionaries, as soon as they themselves shall have attained a competent knowledge of the Gentoo. This language is spoken throughout Golconda, and with little variation in the Cattack and Mahratta countries; so that these Missionaries have ample space for the exertion of their talents and zeal. They are urgent with the society to send more missionaries to their aid.

The names of the two Missionaries who have settled at Vizagpatnam are Messrs. Can and Desgranges. Mr. Ringeltaube has remained at Tranquebar and proposes to labour in the Tamul country.

Two other Missionaries from the same society, Dr. Taylor and Mr. Loveless, who were appointed to form a mission on the opposite side of the Peninsula, at Surat, had arrived at Madras on their way thither.

### AMERICA.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at their meeting at Philadelphia in May last, adopted a resolution, with a view to discountenance and abolish the practice of duelling, in which, after declaring their utter abhorrence of the practice, and of all measures tending to it, as originating in the malevolent dispositions of the human heart and a false sense of honour; as utterly inconsistent with every just principle of moral conduct; as a direct violation of the sixth commandment; and as destructive of the peace and happiness of families; they recommend it to all their ministers scrupulously to refuse to attend the funeral of any person who shall have fallen in a duel; and to admit no person who shall have fought a duel, or given or accepted a challenge, or been accessary thereto, to the distinguishing privileges of the church, until he shall manifest a just sense of his guilt, and give satisfactory evidence of his repentance.

This is an example well worthy the imitation of every Christian community.

### PRISONERS OF WAR.

Considerable exertions are making to improve the opportunity of communicating religious knowledge to the French, Spanish, and Dutch soldiers and sailors, who are prisoners of war in this country, which is afforded by their unfortunate situation. A minister well acquainted with the French language preaches on Sunday to the French on board the prison ships at Portsmouth. Tracts have been printed in French, Spanish, and Dutch, and distributed among the prisoners of those nations. And the New Testament in Spanish is now printing with a view to the same object. The prisoners are said to receive the tracts gladly.

## VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

### CONTINENTAL INTELLIGENCE.

The speech of Bonaparte to his Senate, at the opening of the sessions on the 2d of March, and the *exposé* of his minister relative to the situation of the Empire delivered on the 6th, are calculated to excite a peculiar interest at the present moment. After alluding to the Continental coalition Bonaparte observes, that his armies have never ceased to conquer; that he has avenged the rights of feeble states; that he has enlarged the power of his allies; that his enemies have been humbled and confounded; that the house of Naples has irrecoverably lost its crown; and that the whole of Italy forms a part of the Great Empire. Russia, he affirms, owes the wreck of her army to his forbearance. After having overturned the imperial throne of Austria, he has in his clemency re-established it. In the course of his speech he pays many compliments to his army and to the people at large, whose love, he adds, constitutes his great glory. He represents the finances as prosperous, and as requiring no new burdens. The only allusion made to his navy

is this. "Through the elements we have lost some ships, after an engagement imprudently commenced." "I am desirous," he adds, "of peace with England. On my part I shall never retard that moment. I shall always be ready to conclude it by adopting for its bases the stipulations of the treaty of Amiens."

The *expose* of the Minister of the Interior enlarges with a fatiguing particularity on all the points glanced at in Bonaparte's speech. He follows him step by step in his tour through different parts of France and Italy, exalting every frivolous incident into an occasion of the most unbounded panegyric. At last, he observes, "Astonished England heard the coast of Boulogne resound with the cannon which announced his presence."—"England trembling for her actual existence gave a shriek of terror; and the continent, roused by the shriek, put itself in motion." The transactions of the last campaign in Germany are then detailed, with great pomp of language. In one passage the adulation of this minister assumes the character of gross impiety. After remarking that Bonaparte, while in Moravia, still directed the minutest details of the Government of France; he adds "*He saw every thing—knew every thing, like that Invisible Being who governs the world, and who is only known by his power and his benevolence.*" The events of the last year are soon to be celebrated by a triumphal fete to be given at Paris to the army.

The *exposé* enlarges with a tedious prolixity on the internal improvements which have been effected. The clergy are praised for their loyalty and liberality. "A number of ruinous churches have been repaired, and the influence of religion and morality begin to be felt."—"Crimes have diminished." Six great canals are said to be in a state of forwardness, one to join the Rhine and the Rhone. Basins are digging, quays and moles are constructing, ports are forming and enlarging, telegraphs erecting, and cities building in various quarters.

A message from Bonaparte to the Senate has announced the intended marriage of the Princess Stephanie, "niece of our dearly beloved spouse," and "our daughter" by adoption, with the hereditary Prince of Baden.

The kingdom of Naples has been taken possession of by the French troops with very little resistance, and the Royal Family have fled for safety to Sicily. A French dynasty will now in all probability succeed to the Neapolitan throne. The whole of Italy having thus fallen under the power of Bonaparte, his first object will probably be the rigid exclusion, at least as far as it can be accomplished, of English commerce from all the ports of that country. When the conquest of Naples was announced in the Moniteur, Bonaparte took occasion to issue through that official channel the following significant threat. "We may say without being prophets, that the House which shall again sacrifice the repose, the interest, and the happiness of the continent to the caprices and the guineas of these greedy and insatiable speculators (the English) will lose its throne, to the great joy of all the people on the Continent." What might not the House of Hanover expect, if the power of Bonaparte were equal to his will?

Affairs appear to have been amicably settled for the present between Prussia and France. Hanover, there is reason to think, is ceded in perpetuity to Prussia, in return for Anspach which is bestowed on the King of Bavaria, and Neufchatel and Valengen which are retained by France. Prussia, it is also said, is to give up Cleves and Wesel to the Archduke Ferdinand. These changes furnish a fresh proof that it is Bonaparte's policy, with a view to facilitate his projects of empire, to dissolve all the ancient ties which connect subjects with their rulers. Transferred from the government of their lawful sovereign, and placed under the dominion of strangers, it is impossible the people should feel any such attachments as would lead them to take a lively concern in withstanding farther encroachments on their national rights.

But notwithstanding the appearances of an amicable compromise between France and Prussia, the present aspect of the Continent does not seem to forebode a lasting peace. The French army stationed in Swabia and the countries adjacent has been augmented; the Bavarian army is ordered to be placed on the war footing; and magazines are forming. Against whom these warlike demonstrations are pointed, whether against Prussia, Austria, or Russia, is yet uncertain. In the mean time Prussia disbands none of her troops. Austria instead of disarming is filling up her thinned ranks, while Prince Charles, now appointed Generalissimo of all her armies with extraordinary powers, is directed to employ his activity and skill, in giving them an organization more suited to present circumstances. Russia is assembling an army of 200,000 men in Poland, and looks as if she were reluctant to leave Europe prostrate at Bonaparte's feet. Where

these various movements indicate the renewal of some coalition for the deliverance of Europe, an event scarcely to be expected, perhaps at the present moment scarcely to be wished; or whether they are made with a view to the possible struggle for the partition of the Turkish Empire: or whether they are merely measures of a precautionary nature, dictated by mutual jealousy and distrust; remains still to be discovered.

The utmost vigilance is said to be employed in every country under the influence of Bonaparte, to exclude all goods of British fabric.

### CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

This important settlement has fallen again into the hands of Great Britain. Our troops under the command of Sir David Baird began to land on the 5th of January, and on the 8th marched about 4000 strong to attack the enemy's force which consisted of about 5000 men, a great proportion of it being cavalry. The attack was made by the Highland Brigade under a heavy fire of round shot, grape, and musquetry. "Nothing could surpass or resist," observes the General, "the determined bravery of the troops headed by their gallant leader Brig. Gen. Ferguson. The enemy maintained his position obstinately, but in the moment of charging the valour of British troops bore down all opposition, and forced him to a precipitate retreat." The obstacles which our troops had to encounter appear to have been very considerable; and the distress which they suffered from the want of water and provisions had nearly exhausted them in the moment of victory. From this distressing situation they were relieved by the exertions of Sir Home Popham and the navy. The loss of the enemy in this engagement is said to have been 700 men. Our loss was one captain (Forster) and 14 rank and file killed; 3 field officers, 1 captain, 5 subalterns, and 180 others wounded; and 8 missing.

On the day succeeding this engagement, while our troops were marching towards Cape Town, a flag of truce arrived, and proposed a capitulation, which was acceded to, and the town was immediately surrendered.

By a subsequent dispatch, dated the 13th of January, it appears that after the engagement of the 8th, General Jansens, the Dutch Governor, had retired into the country, carrying with him about 1200 men and 28 pieces of cannon. A part of our army was sent in pursuit of him: but General Baird, with a view to prevent the farther effusion of blood, and the devastation of the country, had made an overture to him which was highly honourable to both parties, and which, it is to be hoped, he will accept. The Moniteur has noticed the capture of the Cape with many derogatory comments on the conduct of the Dutch Governor; and with expressions which indicate some dissatisfaction with the existing Government of Holland.

### AMERICA.

America continues to complain of the conduct of the belligerent powers, and a rupture between her and Spain has been thought probable. The questions at issue with this country have not yet been decided; and the decision will probably involve considerable difficulties. But we entertain no fears that the existing differences will assume a hostile aspect. A few individuals, it is true, are violent and clamorous; but the Government, although some of its communications to Congress on the subject have been unfair and unreasonable, seems disposed to pursue moderate counsels. Great complaints have been made relative to the impressing of American seamen by British officers; and an act was proposed in Congress authorizing and even rewarding resistance to any future attempt of this kind. The good sense of the people at large seems to have reprobated this outrageous violation of the established principles of national polity, and there appears no danger of its passing into a law.

A motion has been made in Congress for imposing a tax of ten dollars a-head on slaves imported into the United States, and it seems likely to be adopted. Its object is to discourage, as far as Congress can discourage, the continuance of importations of slaves into South Carolina, the only State whose ports are now open to such a traffic.

## GREAT BRITAIN.

### PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS.

Since the meeting of Parliament a number of papers has been moved for in the House of Commons, calculated to throw light on the state of our empire in the East; and intended also to serve as the foundation of

charges against the Marquis Wellesley. The gentleman who has stood most prominently forward on this occasion is Mr. *Paull*. These motions have given birth to some interesting discussions, from which it appears that the financial affairs of the Company abroad have experienced considerable embarrassments in consequence of the Mahratta war. The Company's debt is now estimated at 30 millions. The charges which Mr. Paull has announced his intention of preferring against the Marquis Wellesley respect his conduct to the Rajah of Bhurtpore and to other native princes, and the profusion and waste of public money on objects of mere pomp during his administration. Government appear to have no intention of interfering on this occasion. The Grenville party indeed are warmly attached to his Lordship, and seem prepared to undertake his defence. Mr. Fox and his friends have not expressed their purpose openly: It is believed that they disapprove of the policy pursued by Lord Wellesley; but it seems doubtful whether they will afford any encouragement to a retrospective enquiry. It must be the wish, however, of every real friend to the happiness of India and the reputation of Great Britain, that there should arise no impediment to a full, free, and impartial investigation of his Lordship's conduct, while he filled the important station of Governor General. It was with much satisfaction that we heard Mr. *Fox* explicitly disclaiming in the House any wish to alter the present constitution of the Government of India as by law established.

Considerable doubts having arisen, with a particular reference to the case of Lord Melville, whether witnesses in criminal cases are bound to answer questions likely materially to affect their pecuniary interests, the opinions of the twelve judges were taken; when seven of them answered affirmatively and five in the negative. In consequence of this difference of opinion a declaratory act has passed both Houses putting an end to all doubt on the subject, and laying it down as the law of the land, that the apprehension of civil injury is not admissible as a plea for refusing to give evidence in criminal prosecutions.

On the motion for going into a Committee on the army estimates, some questions were put to Ministers respecting their plans of military defence; to which they declined giving any answer. It is therefore uncertain how far Mr. Windham may choose to proceed in reducing to practice those military theories which he was in the habit of developing with so much eloquence when out of office. He has gone so far as to state, that Mr. Pitt's defence act is not likely to continue in force.

Mr. Tierney has brought in a bill for explaining and rendering more effectual the act against treating at elections. The bill proposes to exempt candidates from the enormous demands to which they are now liable, for the conveyance and travelling expences of voters not resident at the place of election, and to prevent the bribery and corruption which are carried on under the pretence of such charges. We very cordially wish success to the honourable gentleman's measure, which we are persuaded would strike at the root of many corrupt practices, while it would relieve the upright candidate for a seat in Parliament from a most oppressive burden.

We adverted in our last to the appointment of Lord Ellenborough to a seat in the Cabinet. This measure, which had produced great dissatisfaction, was brought before both Houses of Parliament on the 3d inst. when a motion was made to the following effect, viz. That it is expedient for the due administration of justice, that none of the common law judges should be members of the Cabinet Council. The motion was negatived in the upper House without a division, and in the lower House by a majority of 222 to 64.

The committee for conducting the impeachment of Lord Melville having complained of the contumacy manifested by Mr. Trotter in refusing to answer their interrogatories, he was ordered into the custody of the Serjeant at Arms, but was discharged the next day, in consequence of his submitting to the proposed examination.

A new article of impeachment has been exhibited against Lord Melville, which states that his Lordship, besides misapplying the sum of £.10,000 as admitted by his own confession, had possessed himself, at an early period of his Treasurership, of sums to the gross amount of £.27,000, which were applied, not to the public service, but to private purposes, and to the accommodation of certain traders with whom he was connected.

## NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

It has pleased Providence again to bless his Majesty's arms with signal success. Another naval victory has been obtained, by which one of the squadrons lately escaped from France is satisfactorily accounted for. On the 6th of February last, Admiral Duckworth having with him seven sail of the line, two frigates, and two sloops, discovered a squadron of French ships,

consisting of five sail of the line, two frigates, and one corvette, at anchor in the bay of Santo Domingo, where they had disembarked 1500 troops. He immediately attacked, and after an action of two hours entirely defeated them. Three ships of the enemy's line, one of 80 guns, and two of 74, fell into our hands, and two (the Imperial of 120 guns bearing Admiral Le Seigle's flag, and a 74) were driven on shore, and afterwards burnt. The frigates and corvette escaped. The enemy's loss is stated to have exceeded 1200 men. Our loss in killed and wounded amounted to 338. No British officer was killed or mortally wounded. Sir John Duckworth has proceeded with his prizes to Jamaica.

The squadron which has been thus lost to the enemy was part of a detachment of the Brest fleet consisting of 11 sail of the line. The remainder is supposed to have gone to the East Indies.

Several privateers have been taken from the enemy, who on the other hand have captured some of our merchantmen, even close to our own shores.

## DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE.

From an account laid before the House of Commons, of the net produce of all the permanent taxes, and of the war taxes, in Great Britain, for the years ending the 5th of January, 1805, and the 5th of January, 1806, it appears, that

The net produce of the permanent taxes, for the year ending 5th January, 1805, amounted to.....£25,147,604 16 4½

And, for the year ending the 5th January, 1806 26,789,074 9 6½

### OF THE WAR TAXES.

For the year ending 5th January, 1805..... 11,418,874 2 1½

For the year ending 5th January, 1806..... 13,171,499 2 4

The increase in the permanent taxes is chiefly in the heads of Excise, Stamps, and Letter-money.

The increase in the war taxes is principally from tea and the property duty.

At a General Court of the India Company, a year and a half's salary (about £40,000) of the late governor general Marquis Cornwallis, was voted to his son the present Marquis, in testimony of the high sense entertained of the eminent services of his deceased father.

The Right Hon. W. B. Ponsonby is created a peer of the united kingdom, by the title of Baron Ponsonby; and the Marquis of Blandford by the title of Baron Spencer.

The arrival of a flag of truce from the French coast on the 20th instant has given birth to many surmises on the subject of peace. A naval officer, Captain Majendie, landed from it and proceeded directly to town. The most probable supposition is that he is merely charged with a commission relative to the exchange of prisoners. As to peace on secure and equitable terms; and any other peace would be delusive and ruinous; we dare not permit ourselves to indulge a hope of it at the present moment. Judging by the recent exposition which Bonaparte has published, both of his domestic and foreign relations, we can discover in him no real disposition to cultivate peace with this country. It is unquestionably his policy to make peace with us; for in no other way can he now hope to raise a navy, the great object of his ambition: but we are greatly mistaken, if his pride and arrogance will not, in this instance, stand in the way of his obvious interest, and lead him to insist on terms, to which even Mr. Fox will be unwilling to lend an ear.

The trial of Governor Picton, which has been delayed for a considerable time, till the necessary evidence should be procured from Trinidada, came on in the Court of King's Bench on Monday the 24th of February. The indictment preferred against him was for having inflicted torture on Louisa Calderon, a creole of that island. The leading circumstances of the cruelty exercised on this unfortunate girl, who was produced and gave evidence in court, and who at the time was only 13 years of age, are as follows. The girl was suspected of having some knowledge of a robbery which had been committed in the house where she lived, and underwent an examination before the Alkalde: but persisting in denying all knowledge of the transaction, the case was referred to Governor Picton, who immediately issued an order for applying the torture. Accordingly she was fixed upon the instrument prepared for that purpose, suspended by the left wrist from the ceiling of the room, and resting with the extremity of the great toe of her right foot on a sharp wooden stake, her right hand and left foot being also tied together behind her back. In this state she remained for 54 minutes, when she was taken down and put in irons for the night. The next morning the same scene was renewed for the space of 22 minutes,

during which the unhappy sufferer fainted away twice. Having at last confessed, she was taken from the torture, but was immediately put in irons, and confined in a place where she could not stand erect, for eight months, when she was liberated. These facts were admitted by the defendant's counsel. The defence set up was of this kind. The laws of Spain authorized torture: the laws of Spain were the laws of Trinidad; and these governor Picton was bound to maintain:—an argument which was thus illustrated. 'The laws of the English island of St. Vincent authorize a justice of the peace, to slit the nose, cut off at discretion any limb, or take away the life, of a person of colour who shall even raise his hand against a white person, whatever may have been the provocation. It would not be fair that a justice of the peace, who under the authority of this barbarous law, had maimed one of his Majesty's subjects, should be tried according to the principles of English jurisprudence. The act of the island would be his justification in a court of law, if not of conscience.' This reasoning was just: but unfortunately for governor Picton, the fact on which it rested, viz. that the laws of Trinidad allowed torture to be inflicted, was not proved. On the contrary, it appeared that that part of the Spanish law which authorized torture, had never been part of the law of this colony; and that, in point of fact, the oldest inhabitant of the island, had never known an instance of torture till its introduction by this British governor. He was of course found *guilty*.

## OBITUARY.

ON the 25th of February, at Edinburgh, in the prime of life, the Rev. DAVID BLACK, one of the ministers of that city. He was a most amiable man, a most exemplary Christian, and a most useful and faithful labourer in his Lord's vineyard. He was taken ill on the fifteenth, but no danger was apprehended for some days: but on the 20th some alarming symptoms made their appearance, and on the fifth day from that time it pleased God to take him to himself in the midst of his days and usefulness, being in the 44th year of his age and the 21st of his ministry. His disorder, which appeared to be an inflammation in the brain, prevented him from leaving his dying testimony to the truth and excellence of that blessed religion which he understood and loved so well, and exemplified with such happy uniformity in his conduct and conversation, in his public ministrations as a pastor, and in every private relation of life. His death was deeply and generally lamented as a public loss, and will long be felt by his congregation and friends.

At Glasgow, on the 17th current, in the 68th year of his age, DAVID DALE, Esq. of Rosebank, late one of the magistrates of this city. The character of this good man comprehended in it so many points of excellence, that only an imperfect outline of it can here be given. He had not enjoyed the advantage of a polished or liberal education; but this want was compensated by a large share of natural sagacity and sound sense, by an accurate and discriminating knowledge of human character, and by a modest and dignified simplicity of manner, which secured to him universal respect and attention. A zealous promoter of general industry and of the manufactures of his country, his schemes of business were extensive and liberal, conducted with singular prudence and perseverance, and, by the blessing of God, were crowned with such abundant success as served to advance his rank in society, and to furnish him with the means of that diffusive benevolence which rendered his life a public blessing, and shed a lustre on his character, that has been but too rarely exemplified. Impelled by the powerful influence of that truth which he firmly believed and zealously taught, constrained by the love, and animated by the example of his blessed Master, his ear was never shut to the cry of distress; his private charities were boundless; and every public institution which had for its object the alleviation or prevention of human misery, in this world or the world to come, received from him the most liberal support and encouragement. For while the leading object of his life was the diffusion of the light of truth in the earth, he gladly embraced every opportunity of becoming, like the patriarchs

of old "eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame," and of causing "the widow's heart to sing for joy." In private life, his conduct, actuated by the same principles, was equally exemplary—for he was a kind parent, a generous friend, a wise and faithful counsellor, "a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate." And now having thus occupied his talents he hath "entered into the joy of his Lord."—"Mark the perfect and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

The remains of this eminent servant of God were interred on the 21st instant. The funeral was attended by the magistrates, by ministers of all denominations, and by between two and three hundred respectable inhabitants.—The concourse of spectators was immense. Several hundreds of poor received a small gratuity in money, after the interment. He honoured God while he lived: he was honoured by all descriptions in his life, and at his death: and though dead will long live in the affectionate remembrance of thousands.

At Dumfries, in Scotland, the Rev. Dr. BURNSIDE, minister of St. Michael's.

Rev. RICHARD BETHEL, rector of St. Peter's, Wallingford.

At Warringstown, co. Antrim, Ireland, in his 84th year, Major HOLT WARING. He fought at the memorable battle of Dettingen, and his intrepidity in the execution of a very dangerous piece of service during the action attracted the notice, and gained him the applause, of his Sovereign.

At Stowe, in the parish of Arlingham, in his 83d year, the Rev. HENRY DAVIES, M. A. upwards of fifty years rector of Chilton, Berks, and many years perpetual curate of Saul, co. Gloucester.

At Halton Holgate, co. Lincoln, Mrs. BARKER, wife of Mr. Robert Barker; leaving him and five small children to mourn her loss. On the following morning, Mrs. Barker (his mother) was found dead in her bed, whither she went the preceding evening in her usual good health.

Mrs. CATHERINE DALE. Travelling from London to the West of England, she alighted from a stage-coach at the Black Horse inn in Salisbury, complained of being indisposed, and expired in a few minutes.

Mr. GEORGE ADNEY, ensign of the 60th Foot, undertook to drink a quart of rum, in consequence of bets being made by other officers; which he nearly accomplished, and retired to bed, where he was found dead the next morning.

At Autun, aged 63, M. de FONTANGES, Archbishop of Autun, and formerly Archbishop of Toulon.

The infant son of Mr. Budd, of Martlett Court, co. Gloucester, a fine child, about three years old. He fell a victim to the negligence of the servant-maid, who had put him in the window of an upper room, through the casement of which he fell into the court below, and was so dreadfully bruised that he almost instantly expired.

Suddenly, in a fit of apoplexy, as is supposed, and in the meridian of life, leaving a wife and family, Mr. HALL, a glazier, of Arnsby, co. Leicester.

As the Newbury coach was turning into the White Hart inn-yard at Newbury, Master AYRES, son of Mr. Ayres, of Cornhill, one of the passengers, putting his head out of the window just at the time, received so violent a contusion, by striking against the gate-post, as to cause his instant death.

In the North of Ireland, the Rev. RICHARD WADDY, rector of Cumber.

Aged 113, JOHN TUCKER, fisherman, at Itching Ferry, Southampton: who followed his usual occupation till within a few weeks of his death.

Lately, at St. Petersburg, Count ALEXANDER WORONZOFF.

Mr. OLIVER, one of the surveyors belonging to the East India Company, stepping over the tier of shipping at Deptford, fell between two ships, and was unfortunately drowned.

Feb. 1. At Stoke Newington, at the very advanced age of nearly 98, without a single sigh or groan, Mrs. SARAH WOOLLASTON, for more than 40 years the relict of Israel Woollaston, Esq.

At Paddington, Mr. SYKES, a farmer, who resided near Stamford, Lincolnshire. Having spent the evening with a party at the house of a friend, he fell over a bannister, in his way down stairs, and fractured his skull.

At Clapham, Mrs. GARRATT, wife of Francis Garratt, Esq.

At Warkworth, Mrs. BATES, relict of the Rev. Dr. Bates. She was reading the morning-service to a sister who was very ill, herself apparently in perfect health, when she dropped down and instantly expired.

In her 20th year, Miss ANNE MILNE, a daughter of the Rev. Dr. Colin Milne, of Deptford, Kent; and, on the 15th, another of his daughters, Miss HARRIET-MARIA MILNE, aged 21; both of consumption.

At her lodgings in Clarges-street, Piccadilly, in her 89th year, Mrs. ELIZABETH CARTER, daughter of Nicholas Carter, D. D. rector of Woodchurch; a lady who has for a long time enjoyed a very distinguished pre-eminence in the literary world. She published all the Works of Epictetus which are now extant, translated from the original Greek, with an introduction and notes by the translator; and Poems on several occasions. Mrs. Carter was also the contributor of two papers to "The Rambler," which, we are told, had much of Dr. Johnson's esteem, viz. No. 44, which consists of an allegory where religion and superstition are delineated; and No. 100, which is a letter on modish pleasures, bearing the signature of Chariessa.

March 20, at Guildford, in Surrey, ANN RUSSELL, the eldest daughter of the late Mr. John Russell. She was confined to her bed three months, when she displayed a patient and humble submission to the providence which afflicted her and at length summoned her to an eternal rest.

March 11, in Devonshire-street, London, Mrs. BOOTH, wife of Mr. Booth, and daughter of Mr. Healey, of Nottingham; after having borne a lingering illness with exemplary and Christian fortitude.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

*The Golden Pillar*, the Essay on *Flattery*; A TRUE ENGLISHMAN; S. G.; C.; MEM.; H. A. M.; Νεανισκος; and THE FATHER OF A LARGE FAMILY; will appear.

S. B.; T. L. C.; G.; J. O.; A GENTILE; J. F. G.; UNA; and AN ENQUIRER; are are under consideration.

V. G. came too late to be of use this year.

We beg to assure γ. κ. that the insertion of the lines was the act of our judgment.

If IOTA will leave with us his real name and address, no improper use will be made of them, and his wants may perhaps be attended to.

A LOVER OF THE TRUTH must have read the article to which he alludes with extreme inattention, if he supposes that it has any tendency to lead those to expect the death, who have not lived the life, of the righteous.

We have no recollection whatever of the circumstances to which C. O. T. alludes. The only paper of his which we promised to insert, he will find in our Numbers for February and March, 1805. His not having received the Appendix for 1805, must be owing to his Bookseller's negligence. The plan which he proposes was objected to by the Booksellers generally. We thank C. O. T. for his steady friendship.

### *ERRATA.*

Number for February, p. 134, col. 2. The three last paragraphs under the head of *Parliamentary Proceedings* ought to stand under that of *Domestic Intelligence*.

Present Number, p. 137, col. 2, l. 3, from bottom, after *is* insert *a Comma*.

P. 165, col. 1. l. 24 from bottom, after *opposition* insert *a comma*.

P. 181, col. 1. l. 16. for *alternation* read *alternative*.

Q. writes to say that he fears there may be some ambiguity in the concluding sentence of his paper inserted in this No. p. 143. His allusion is to the Anti-jacobin Reviewers, Mr. Daubeny, Dr. Kipling, &c. &c. and to *their* estimate of Christianity.

The following important Article of Literary Intelligence has been omitted, viz.

A publication is preparing for the Press in successive numbers and volumes, to be entitled "The Fathers of the English Church; or, a Selection from the Writings of the Reformers, and early Protestant Divines of the Church of England.